CONFIDENTIAL

378

1	STATE OF MINNESOTA	DISTRICT COURT
2	COUNTY OF RAMSEY	SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
3		Case Type: Other Civil
4	The State of Minnesota, by Hubert H. Humphrey, III,	
5	its Attorney General,	
6	Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota,	
7		
0	Plaintiffs,	
8	vs.	File No. C1-94-8565
9	Philip Morris Incorporated, R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Compan	77
10	Brown & Williamson Tobacco C	_
	B.A.T. Industries P.L.C., Lo	
11	Tobacco Company, The America	
1.0	Company, Liggett Group, Inc.	
12	for Tobacco Research-U.S.A., The Tobacco Institute, Inc.,	Inc., and
13	ine robacco institute, ine.,	
	Defendants.	
14		
15		
1.0		
16		
17	DEPOSITION OF DR	. HYMAN BERMAN
18	Volume II, Pag	es 378 - 591
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	STIREWALT &	ASSOCIATES
	P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS	, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

379

1	(The following is the continuation of the
2	deposition of DR. HYMAN BERMAN, taken pursuant to
3	Notice of Taking Deposition, at the offices of Dorsey
4	& Whitney, Pillsbury Center South, 220 South Sixth
5	Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, commencing at
6	9:35 a.m., September 16, 1997.
7	******
8	APPEARANCES
9	On Behalf of the Plaintiffs:
10	William H. Manning
11	Robins, Kaplan, Miller & Ciresi, L.L.P. 2800 LaSalle Plaza 800 LaSalle Avenue
12	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2015
13	On Behalf of Defendant Lorillard Tobacco Company: Allen R. Purvis & John C. Monica, Jr.
14	Shook, Hardy & Bacon Market Square West
15	801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20004-2615
16	On Behalf of Defendant Philip Morris:
17	Charles C. Lemley Arnold & Porter
18	555 Twelfth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004-5999
19	
20	On Behalf of Defendant R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company: Rachel Spector Gray, Plant, Mooty, Mooty & Bennett, PA
21	33 South Sixth Street Suite 3400, City Center
22	Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
23	
24	
25	
	STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
	P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

C O N F I D E N T I A L

380

1	INDEX									
2	THE WITNESS	F.Y A N	MINED BY	PAGE						
3										
4	Dr. Berman	Mr.	Manning	382						
5										
6		EXHIE	BIT INDE	2 X						
7										
8	EXHIBIT # P	AGE MARKED	DESCRIPTION							
9	3139	439	10/9/62 Lette Hahn to Hartr							
10	3140	442	2/4/65 Memo Welch to TI							
11	21.41	4.4.4		Taalbb.						
12 13	3141	444	Smoking and H The Present H the U.K. And	osition in						
13			Came About							
14	3142	470	12/11/84 Lett Kloepfer to E							
15	3143	479	6/10/88 Memo							
16			Curry to Wold							
17	3144	483	8/29/95 Lette							
18			Association,	Inc.						
19	3145	487	January 1964 ProposalRes	search on						
20			Trends in Cig	garette						
21			Smoking Among	reenagers						
22	3146	488	1/3/71 TI Doc	ument						
22	3147	495	4/19/73 Lette							
23			Galyan to Sta	ınden						
24	3148	508	Acknowledgement for Confident							
25				_						

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

1	3149	527	4/11/85 Memorandum Mozingo to Brozek
3	3150	532	1988 MN Legislative Plan/ MN 1987 Legislative Overview
4 5	3151	541	Camel Y&R Orientation
6	3152		(Not introduced)
7	3153	550	8/25/89 Letter Spach to Jorgens
9	3154	553	5/30/90 Letter Fishel to Mayor Fraser
10 11	3155	563	3/6/85 Memo Forsythe to Sharp
12	3156	571	2/7/74 Memo Blackmar to McReynolds
13 14	3157	572	7/29/74 Memo Pizer to Pittman
15	3158	573	4/22/81 Memo Stebbins to Veatch
16	3159	577	Product Movie Placement
17 18	3160	579	6/14/83 Letter Ripslinger to Stallone
19			
20			
21			
22			
23 24			
25			

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

	\Box	D	\sim	α	177	177	Γ	т	Ν	\sim	C
_	P	\mathbf{r}	U		Ŀ	Ŀ	ע		TΛ	G	D

2

- 3 BY MR. MANNING:
- 4 Q. Professor Berman, you understand that you're
- 5 still under oath here this morning?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. And just as a matter of a few preliminary
- 8 questions, as we agreed yesterday, you're attempting
- 9 to be objective in this case; correct?
- 10 A. That is correct.
- 11 Q. And you attempt to do your exercise here within
- 12 the constraints of academic freedom?
- 13 A. Absolutely.
- 14 Q. And you, in that regard, attempt to perform your
- 15 assignment with integrity?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And not to sacrifice your integrity?
- 18 A. That is absolutely correct.
- 19 Q. Or your morality?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- 21 Q. And if the question that you researched becomes
- 22 too narrow, you have absolutely agreed that you will
- 23 widen it?
- 24 A. Yes, I certainly would.
- 25 Q. And if it becomes apparent to you in the course

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES

- 1 of this deposition that it's too narrow, you will
- 2 widen it?
- 3 A. I certainly would.
- 4 Q. You'll announce it right here?
- 5 A. I would announce it right here.
- 6 Q. And if it becomes apparent to you after this
- 7 deposition that it's too narrow, you would
- 8 communicate that to me?
- 9 A. I certainly would.
- 10 Q. As a matter -- and you would even do that on
- 11 your own, against the -- I mean you would talk with
- 12 your lawyers, but you would, nonetheless, insist the
- 13 communication be made as a matter of integrity?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And as we also agreed, if you determine that the
- 16 clients who you are working for, the tobacco
- 17 industry, and the various tobacco groups, are lying,
- 18 you will withdraw from the case?
- 19 A. I would have to have conclusive evidence of
- 20 that.
- 21 Q. And if you do, you will withdraw?
- 22 A. If it's conclusive evidence beyond a shadow of a
- 23 doubt.
- 24 Q. And if you -- okay. And so --
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. So you would need that conclusive evidence
- 2 beyond a shadow of a doubt?
- 3 A. Right.
- 4 Q. But if you smell it, will it -- if it smells
- 5 like they're lying, not conclusive, but if it smells
- 6 that way, will you widen the question?
- 7 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 8 BY MR. MANNING:
- 9 Q. And determine whether or not lying does exist
- 10 here and that you are in support of it? Will you do
- 11 that as a matter of integrity?
- 12 A. That is not my research design.
- 13 Q. I understand that. That's not my question.
- 14 A. No. I understand your question. I'm trying to
- 15 tell you what my research design was.
- 16 Q. I don't want to hear that any more.
- 17 A. All right.
- 18 Q. You can tell me as much as you want, but listen
- 19 to my question very carefully because I know what
- 20 your research design was.
- 21 My question to you is this. Please listen.
- 22 If you smell just a little bit that there may be
- 23 lying here, will you, as a matter of integrity,
- 24 professional academic integrity, insist that you
- 25 widen the question and take a broader look? Will you

- 1 do that?
- 2 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 3 THE WITNESS: My question is already very, very
- 4 wide.
- 5 BY MR. MANNING:
- 6 Q. Will you --
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. Will you answer my question, please?
- 9 A. I'm answering it the way I can. And that is to
- 10 say that the question that I have asked of this
- 11 particular historical project is as wide as we can
- 12 possibly make it.
- 13 Q. That's your view. It's as wide as --
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Even though by your own definition it doesn't
- 16 include the tobacco companies at all?
- 17 A. No, it does include the tobacco companies.
- 18 Q. Pardon me?
- 19 A. It does include the tobacco companies. You must
- 20 have misunderstood me.
- 21 Q. It does include the tobacco companies?
- 22 A. It most certainly does.
- 23 Q. But you -- then you've included the tobacco
- 24 companies without looking at one tobacco document?
- 25 A. That is absolutely correct.

- 1 Q. Without interviewing one tobacco executive?
- 2 A. That is absolutely correct.
- 3 Q. And you have found -- how does it include the
- 4 tobacco companies?
- 5 A. My project is, in fact, what do the people of
- 6 Minnesota and the state -- the various state agencies
- 7 knew -- know or knew about the health hazards of
- 8 smoking? When did they know it? They knew this kind
- 9 of information from public sources; therefore, the
- 10 tobacco industry public sources were taken into
- 11 account in my research.
- 12 Q. Now, but let's --
- 13 A. Not the private sources.
- MR. PURVIS: Let him answer,
- 15 BY MR. MANNING:
- 16 Q. Are you finished? I'm sorry.
- 17 A. No.
- 18 Q. Okay.
- 19 A. The private sources were not known then, and
- 20 only recently have become known. Historians don't do
- 21 post facto analysis. And, consequently, my research
- 22 is as broad as it possibly can be. The public
- 23 sources were used.
- 24 Q. So in your view it includes the tobacco
- 25 companies' public sources, your work?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. That is absolutely correct.
- 2 Q. That is what you just told me; correct?
- 3 A. What appeared in the press. What appeared in
- 4 the press was, in fact, what was used -- what was
- 5 seen by the public, what was seen by the state, it
- 6 was what I used in my research.
- 7 Q. Now, what appeared in the press?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. I'm asking you what you just told me under oath.
- 10 A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. What you just told me was that you included the
- 12 tobacco companies' public sources.
- 13 A. Public sources as I were able to find them.
- 14 Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Now list for me right now in your report on page
- 16 one through thirty-seven in the attachments that
- 17 lists everything in your six file drawers -- list for
- 18 me what of those items are tobacco company public
- 19 sources. List them for me right now. Take your
- 20 time, go through them.
- 21 A. Whatever -- I can't -- I can't and I won't.
- 22 Q. No, no, no, no. Don't tell me you won't.
- 23 MR. PURVIS: Object. Let him finish his
- 24 answer.
- 25 THE WITNESS: Let me finish my sentence,

- 1 please.
- 2 BY MR. MANNING:
- 3 Q. Go ahead.
- 4 A. What I have used was tobacco industry public
- 5 sources as it appeared in the public press. And,
- 6 therefore, you will find references in the Tribune,
- 7 the -- whatever public press there is. And I've used
- 8 that in the consideration of my work, sir.
- 9 Q. And I'm -- we can stay here.
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Point to me --
- 12 Let me make very clear to you -- don't tell me
- 13 you won't do anything. Because you can't do that.
- MR. PURVIS: I object to this attitude. You pay
- 15 this witness respect. You've been threatening him
- 16 and you are lecturing him. You have not given him
- 17 the respect that is accorded to a witness in these
- 18 proceedings. You've interrupted him and we're not
- 19 going to let this go on. I let you do it yesterday.
- 20 It's not going to happen today.
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. Point to me, sir, one item on page one through
- 23 thirty-seven that is a tobacco company public
- 24 source. Point it out to me.
- 25 A. Minneapolis Tribune 1994. Unlimited articles

- 1 listed below.
- 2 Q. What page are you on, sir?
- 3 A. Page eighteen, which gives me a blanket
- 4 statement regarding that.
- 5 Q. Let me find where you're pointing.
- 6 A. Page eighteen, bottom of the page.
- 7 Q. You pointed to which -- let me hear what you
- 8 said. Which one, please?
- 9 A. I said page eighteen, Minneapolis Tribune, we
- 10 went through the whole thing, from 1994, which
- 11 included statements --
- 12 Q. I'm asking which one you're pointing out to me,
- 13 sir. All of the articles?
- 14 A. Sorry?
- 15 Q. What are you pointing to here?
- 16 A. I'm pointing to -- on page eighteen.
- 17 Q. Yes, sir.
- 18 A. Minneapolis Tribune, 1994. Including, but not
- 19 limited to the articles listed below. And now let me
- 20 look at the articles listed below.
- 21 (Reviewing document.)
- 22 Minneapolis Tribune, March 27, 1953, "Tobacco
- 23 Men Fight Tax Cut. " That's one.
- 24 Q. Which item was that, sir?
- 25 A. Item -- that's on page twenty-one.

- 1 Minneapolis -- March 27, 1953. "Tobacco Men Fight
- 2 Tax Cut."
- 3 Q. Okay. That's the first one you've pointed out
- 4 to me?
- 5 A. That's the first one I've seen. But there may
- 6 be others. Remember, this is only representative
- 7 examples.
- 8 Q. You point every one of them out to me --
- 9 A. I'll --
- 10 Q. And then I will go back and question you about
- 11 each one. Take as long as you want.
- 12 A. I would have to review them before -- if you're
- 13 going to question me about them.
- 14 Q. Let me explain to you the question, sir.
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Don't argue with me. Let me finish my
- 17 question.
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Continue to point out, on anywhere, page one
- 20 through thirty-seven, any item that is, as you have
- 21 told me under oath, a tobacco company public source
- 22 that you relied on. Continue to tell me. I've noted
- 23 the first one.
- 24 A. Okay. Minneapolis Tribune, January 1, 1954.
- 25 "Tobacco Industry Joint Plan Vetoed."

- 1 Q. Thank you.
- 2 A. January 4, 1954, "A Frank Statement to Cigarette
- 3 Smokers."
- 4 Q. Thank you.
- 5 A. January 4, 1954, "Tobacco Group to Study
- 6 Cancer."
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 A. October 20, 1954, "Tobacco Industry Opens Study
- 9 of Product's Effects."
- 10 Q. Okay.
- 11 A. We were -- we jumped between -- from '54 to --
- 12 quite a bit here because we were still working on the
- 13 indexing of this material. So I can't tell you what
- 14 was in here between '54, except for the few items
- 15 there.
- But let's go on to '64. Again, '64 was spotty,
- 17 although we have a lot of material there with the
- 18 surgeon general's report and stuff like that.
- 19 In terms of the bibliography spotty.
- Now we jump for -- now it's -- now the
- 21 New York Times. If I'm not mistaken, the December 6,
- 22 1959 article of the New York Times, "Science in
- 23 Review: Controversy on Lung Cancer and Smoking
- 24 Flares Up Again Over the Statistics, " does include
- 25 tobacco-industry material.

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- January 19, 1960, New York Times, "Emphasis
- 2 Disputed in Cancer Findings, "includes
- 3 tobacco-industry material.
- 4 September 8, 1961, New York Times, "Smoking
- 5 Doubted as Cancer Cause, "includes tobacco-industry
- 6 material.
- 7 St. Paul Pioneer Press, January 4, 1954,
- 8 "Cigaret Firms Study Fag-Cancer Rumor."
- 9 Q. I'm sorry, what page?
- 10 A. Page thirty.
- 11 Q. Thank you.
- 12 A. St. Paul Pioneer Press.
- 13 Q. Which one?
- 14 A. Associated Press report.
- 15 Q. Okay.
- 16 A. January 4, 1954.
- 17 Q. Thank you.
- 18 A. If I'm not mistaken, the Minneapolis Star,
- 19 Associated Press, page thirty-one, "Low-tar
- 20 Cigarettes Safer, Study Shows, "September 15, 1976,
- 21 comes from industry sources.
- U.S. News & World Report, John Heller, article,
- 23 "The Truth About Smoking and Lung Cancer," July 26,
- 24 1957, includes tobacco-industry material, I believe.
- 25 I think -- go back and look at the beginning. I

- 1 didn't look at the beginning. Let's start.
- 2 CBS News, "Cigarettes and Lung Cancer," did have
- 3 industry spokesmen on it.
- 4 CBS News, "On Smoking and Health," '64, had
- 5 industry spokesmen on it.
- 6 CBS News -- no, strike that.
- 7 CBS News, "See It Now," 1965, had industry
- 8 spokesmen on it.
- 9 The clips of CBS News, 1957 to '59, had industry
- 10 spokesmen periodically on it.
- 11 Q. I'm sorry, which one was that one?
- 12 A. Sorry?
- 13 Q. When you say "the clips" I'm not following.
- 14 A. CBS News' news clips came from Vanderbilt
- 15 archives.
- 16 Q. Where is that listed?
- 17 A. One, two, three -- fourth from the bottom,
- 18 "Stories on Smoking."
- 19 Q. Thank you.
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. Go ahead.
- 22 Are you marking these, sir, so you can refer
- 23 back to them?
- 24 A. No, I haven't. I've just been going through
- 25 them as quickly as I possibly can.

- 1 Q. Just put a little mark next to the one. But
- 2 I've got them all marked and numbered, so I'll bring
- 3 them back to you.
- 4 A. Okay.
- 5 Billy Yeargin, page fourteen, "The Anti-Smoking
- 6 Campaign Failed, But Did Some Damage, " Tobacco
- 7 International, March 21, 1980.
- 8 Q. I'm sorry, where was that on the page, please?
- 9 Fourteen you say?
- 10 A. Third from the top. Page fourteen, fourth from
- 11 the top.
- 12 Q. Thank you. Got it. Okay. Thank you.
- Go ahead.
- 14 A. If I'm not mistaken, Tobacco Leaf is an industry
- 15 publication. And "Some Day We'll Do It: That is,
- 16 Make an Organized Effort to Have Cigars Featured by
- 17 Screen and Radio, "Tobacco Leaf, September 29, 1934.
- 18 See that?
- 19 Q. Yes. That's tobacco-company public source?
- 20 A. Yes.
- 21 Q. Thank you.
- 22 A. "Smoking an Aid, Rather than Injury to
- 23 Soldiers, "Tobacco News, June 13, 1918.
- 24 Q. Another tobacco-company source?
- 25 A. Tobacco-company source.

- 1 "Tobacco Stimulates Mental Activity," Canadian
- 2 Cigarette and Tobacco Journal, October 1918.
- 3 "Army 95 Percent Users of Tobacco:
- 4 Quartermaster General's Report Reveals Also That It
- 5 Was Deemed Almost a Necessity for the Welfare of
- 6 Men, " Tobacco Leaf, September 26, 1918.
- 7 "A Philip Morris Executive Assays the
- 8 Battleground, "Tobacco Journal, March 10, 1977.
- 9 Q. Tobacco-company source?
- 10 A. Tobacco-company source.
- 11 Q. Thank you.
- 12 A. Sorry. I forgot.
- I am not sure of this, but the Association Forum
- 14 on page fifteen, sixth from the top, "The Right to
- 15 Smoke, " November/December 1963, I think that's an
- 16 industry source.
- 17 Q. Okay.
- 18 A. Although not an industry source, the Columbia
- 19 Journalism Review, Summer of 1963, third from the
- 20 bottom on page fifteen, "Smoking and News: Coverage
- 21 of a Decade of Controversy," in which industry
- 22 spokesmen are cited, I believe.
- 23 Q. Okay.
- 24 A. April 1954 Cosmopolitan Magazine, again, this
- 25 is -- I think, page sixteen, cigarettes -- rather,

- 1 Bob Considint, "To Smoke or Not to Smoke," does
- 2 include industry statements or industry attitudes.
- 3 Q. Thank you.
- 4 A. The Duluth News Tribune, page sixteen, second
- 5 from the bottom, "Health Experts Undecided on
- 6 Filtered Cigarets," July 24, 1957, includes industry
- 7 statements.
- 8 Q. Thank you.
- 9 A. Again, this is -- I don't remember every one of
- 10 these items so, therefore, it is my reasonable guess
- 11 that the Duluth News Tribune, February 11, 1990, top
- 12 of page seventeen, "Faction Claims Cigarette Machines
- 13 Don't Smoke, People Do," has industry materials in
- 14 it.
- 15 Q. Thank you.
- 16 A. Fortune Magazine, December 1953, "The Uproar in
- 17 Cigarettes."
- 18 Fortune Magazine, January 1963, "Embattled
- 19 Tobacco's New Strategy."
- Fortune Magazine, November 1967, Gene Bylinsky,
- 21 "The Search for a Safer Cigarette."
- 22 Q. Thank you.
- 23 A. Life magazine, December 21, 1953, "Smoke Gets in
- 24 the News," does have industry statements, I believe.
- 25 Literary Digest, January 15, 1916, top of page

- 1 eighteen, "Anti-tobacco Exaggerations," do have
- 2 industry statements and attitudes.
- 3 Q. Sure.
- 4 A. Literary Digest, July 15, 1919, "Must Lady
- 5 Nicotine Follow John Barleycorn?" There's an
- 6 industry statement.
- 7 Q. Good.
- 8 A. I think this is where we -- I'm not sure. Let
- 9 me just -- yes. 1909 forward.
- 10 Q. Uh-huh. Okay, sir.
- 11 A. Just to be sure.
- 12 Yes.
- 13 Q. Now, sir, when I counted -- and I numbered them
- 14 as you listed them, was that you are indicating to
- 15 me, or to this record, that there are thirty-two
- 16 sources that you've identified on pages one through
- 17 thirty-seven, of the materials that you put in your
- 18 report that are the basis of your report, that in
- 19 these sources are tobacco companies' public
- 20 statements and the public sources that you
- 21 considered?
- 22 A. Among others.
- 23 Q. But these, at least, are the ones in your pages
- 24 one through thirty-seven that you can identify right
- 25 now? We've taken twenty minutes or a half hour to do

- 1 it; correct?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. You've had all the time you've wanted?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. And you've identified these thirty-two --
- 6 whatever they are, articles, we'll come back and talk
- 7 about them, characterize them, --
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. -- as the public sources that you, as an
- 10 academic of integrity, took into account in
- 11 formulating your opinion; correct?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. And it was because you took into account the
- 14 public statements of the tobacco industry, in these
- 15 thirty-two sources, that you claim that there's some
- 16 objectivity in your report?
- 17 A. There is complete objectivity in my report.
- 18 Q. Yes, sir.
- 19 A. Not some, but complete.
- 20 Q. And the reason that there is complete
- 21 objectivity is that you also -- one of the reasons
- 22 there is complete objectivity is that you considered
- 23 the views of the tobacco companies in their public
- 24 sources; correct?
- 25 A. That is partly correct. Among other things,

- 1 yes. I concluded that as the total package of
- 2 information that was before me and evidence that was
- 3 before me, yes, sir.
- 4 Q. Now, of these thirty-two -- well, did you
- 5 include anything else that you can remember, as you
- 6 sit here right now, as the tobacco company public
- 7 sources, other than the thirty-two articles you've
- 8 identified?
- 9 A. Yes. There are other articles which have not
- 10 appeared in the bibliography, but I cannot recall
- 11 them offhand.
- 12 Q. Similar to the ones --
- 13 A. Similar to the ones dealing with responses of
- 14 the industry towards certain events or certain things
- 15 that came up during the course of news-making events.
- 16 Q. Are there any other public sources, then? Other
- 17 than the ones here and the ones that aren't listed
- 18 that are similar to what's here? That you took into
- 19 account?
- 20 A. If I'm not mistaken, I had seen whatever public
- 21 advertisements that industry sources put out through
- 22 the years.
- 23 Q. Sure. Anything else?
- 24 A. That's -- that is about it. I think. There may
- 25 be others, but that's what I can recall at the

- 1 present time, yes.
- 2 Q. Now you did not review annual reports of tobacco
- 3 companies?
- 4 A. No.
- 5 Q. You did not review any public reports that are
- 6 available from the Council for Tobacco Research or
- 7 the Tobacco Institute?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. You didn't look for those materials in the
- 10 course --
- 11 A. No, I did not.
- 12 Q. -- course of your historical research?
- 13 A. No.
- 14 Q. Now, -- and you, of course, are aware that these
- 15 are public companies and those are public documents
- 16 and they're publicly available?
- 17 A. Yes, I know that.
- 18 Q. You know how to get those as a historian?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. You chose not to?
- 21 A. I chose not to.
- 22 Q. Now, would you agree that most of the articles
- 23 that you cited in here -- and I'm happy to go through
- 24 them, and count them, and show them to you again, and
- 25 I'm only giving this by way of estimates. That most

- 1 of the articles, not all, but most of the articles of
- 2 the thirty-two you cited to me, are pre-1955; in
- 3 other words, of the thirty-two, approximately twenty
- 4 of them, at least --
- 5 A. Probably true.
- 6 Q. -- are pre-1955?
- 7 A. Yes, I think -- you've estimated that, I think,
- 8 accurately.
- 9 Q. Right. I mean if we both took the time to count
- 10 it might be twenty-four?
- 11 A. Whatever.
- 12 Q. It might be eighteen? And that's why we're
- 13 saying an estimate?
- 14 A. I'll go along with that, yes, sir.
- 15 Q. Now, would you also agree that of the
- 16 thirty-two, almost all are press accounts, either
- 17 newspapers or magazines?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. And would you also agree that the material, as
- 20 you reviewed it, the public statements, in these
- 21 thirty-two press accounts, newspapers, and magazines,
- 22 of the tobacco companies, was a denial of any harmful
- 23 effects of tobacco?
- 24 A. Early denial. Later -- what should we say,
- 25 vacillation.

- 1 Q. Equivocation?
- 2 A. Equivocation.
- 3 Q. So early statements of the thirty-two, we agreed
- 4 that approximately twenty are pre-'55, those are
- 5 denial?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. After '55 there's equivocation?
- 8 A. Equivocation.
- 9 Q. By equivocation we mean that denial continues,
- 10 but the word maybe is kind of in there, to your
- 11 perception?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. But never is there an admission in these public
- 14 materials that you reviewed, by the tobacco industry,
- 15 that their products cause cancer; correct?
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 Q. Or that they are addictive?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. And so you took the tobacco companies at their
- 20 word when you reviewed these materials?
- 21 A. I took the tobacco companies not at their word,
- 22 but I took the tobacco companies -- what they stated
- 23 there, looking at it -- seeing how the people
- 24 perceived that, factored that in.
- 25 Q. You factored in how the people perceived what

- 1 the tobacco companies were saying?
- 2 A. That is correct.
- 3 Q. And was your perception -- did you ever conclude
- 4 that what the peoples' perception of what the tobacco
- 5 companies were saying, was a baldfaced lie?
- 6 A. I'm part of the people and I lived through that
- 7 time. And I certainly felt that it was equivocation
- 8 at best; a lie, if you wish. Yes.
- 9 Q. So you felt that when you lived through the
- 10 time?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. And you also felt that when you look back and
- 13 looked at these materials, --
- 14 A. That is correct.
- 15 Q. -- that at best it was an equivocation, but in
- 16 fact, some people would be legitimate in interpreting
- 17 this as a lie?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. Now, you also, I take it, found that some people
- 20 would take the tobacco companies at their word? Not
- 21 all people would interpret them as liars?
- 22 A. I would assume so.
- 23 Q. And you were not able to do any breakdown as to
- 24 the people of America, or Minnesota, as to what
- 25 numbers thought they were liars and what numbers took

- 1 heart in what they were saying as an incentive to
- 2 allow them to keep smoking?
- 3 A. Not directly, no, sir.
- 4 Q. In the course of your review on the question
- 5 that you've articulated, as we were talking earlier,
- 6 if in fact you determined, as we talked about, that
- 7 your clients, the people who are putting money in
- 8 your pocket, are lying, as you suspected and believed
- 9 that they were when you read these materials, when
- 10 you were a --
- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. -- person living through these times, you would
- 13 have the integrity to withdraw from this case and
- 14 stand up and say, as we talked about, that they're
- 15 lying; correct?
- 16 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form of the question
- 17 THE WITNESS: I'll refuse to answer that
- 18 question.
- 19 BY MR. MANNING:
- 20 Q. You refuse to answer that question?
- 21 A. Yes, sir. Because I think that's a loaded
- 22 question and it has a bearing on something that
- 23 had -- that tries to make a historical judgment lead
- 24 to a present action. And that I think is not what
- 25 historians do. And that is not what I will do.

- 1 Q. Let me talk to you about it for a moment,
- 2 historically; okay?
- 3 A. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. You told me that when you read it, you thought
- 5 they were lying.
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. And when you read these public -- thirty-two
- 8 public statements, in looking back on them, when they
- 9 made them, you remembered that they were lying and
- 10 you determined when you read them that they were
- 11 either a lie or equivocation?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. Depending on the timing of it?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. And these thirty-two sources, as you've
- 16 acknowledged, are the public sources of the tobacco
- 17 companies that you relied on for your historical
- 18 opinion?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- 20 Q. That you're offering in this case about the
- 21 knowledge of the people of Minnesota?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- 23 Q. Thank you.
- 24 So if in fact in your historical analysis, not
- 25 as an individual, but as a historian, you determined

- 1 that there were lies occurring, minimum pre-'55, and
- 2 afterwards equivocation, then did you consider --
- 3 have you considered that the rendering of your
- 4 opinion with respect to knowledge of the State of
- 5 Minnesota, the governor, the people, Department of
- 6 Health, Department of Education, the knowledge that
- 7 they may have had, that you've rendered an opinion
- 8 on, is based on lies?
- 9 A. The industry was not perceived as a credible
- 10 source by the public.
- 11 Q. Would you agree with me that nowhere in your
- 12 report, anywhere in your forty-seven page report, do
- 13 you tell the jury, the judge, and the people of
- 14 Minnesota, that you personally, and you as a
- 15 historian, determined that these tobacco companies
- 16 were lying? You didn't do that, did you?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 18 BY MR. MANNING:
- 19 Q. You didn't do that?
- 20 A. That was not my purpose.
- 21 Q. That wasn't your purpose?
- 22 A. Correct.
- 23 Q. We've established that here.
- 24 A. That was not my purpose.
- 25 Q. I understand that wasn't your purpose.

- 1 A. I mean that may be your purpose, but it's not
- 2 mine.
- 3 Q. Sir, you understand that your lawyers spoke to
- 4 you that you were going to come here for purposes of
- 5 cross-examination?
- 6 A. I certainly do. I understand that. Yes.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- Now, if you determined from sources that aren't
- 9 public, sources that I show you, --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- that confirm in your mind -- confirm that, in
- 12 fact, the tobacco companies are lying, will you stand
- 13 up and have the integrity to withdraw from this
- 14 case?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form of the question.
- 16 BY MR. MANNING:
- 17 Q. Will you?
- 18 A. That is not my purpose here. My purpose is to
- 19 do a historical research of a particular kind, in
- 20 which the industry lying has little if any bearing on
- 21 what I do.
- 22 Q. What I am talking to you about is your
- 23 credentials and background and academic integrity.
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. That's what I'm talking about.

- 1 A. Yes, please do.
- 2 Q. I understand your purpose, believe me. I've
- 3 read your report and I understand the purpose of your
- 4 opinion?
- 5 A. Uh-huh.
- 6 Q. What I'm asking you, as an expert, attempting to
- 7 offer an opinion in a court of law, that if in the
- 8 next few hours, as I show you documents, as I did
- 9 yesterday, that in your mind, as a historian, as you
- 10 read those documents, and analyze them, as you're
- 11 capable of doing, as you've done, if these tobacco
- 12 company documents that aren't private -- that aren't
- 13 public, but are quote, private, may become public,
- 14 but right now are private, if they confirm in your
- 15 mind what you already know, is that the tobacco
- 16 companies were lying, and doing it in an orchestrated
- 17 way, to influence public opinion, public perception,
- 18 will you have the integrity to withdraw?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- THE WITNESS: That was not what I was designed
- 21 to do.
- 22 First of all, let me say that --
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. Let --
- 25 MR. PURVIS: Let him finish.

- 1 THE WITNESS: What the tobacco industry did
- 2 internally among themselves, with its lawyers, have
- 3 no bearing on the research question that I asked.
- 4 The internal operations of the tobacco industry
- 5 are of no concern to me. Their documents -- as a
- 6 historian. In this particular instance.
- 7 They -- the internal documentation that you will
- 8 show me are irrelevant to my particular research
- 9 question.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Now let me, sir, repeat the exact question.
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. I'm not going to argue with you. Your lawyer
- 14 may object, which he's welcome to do. I respectfully
- 15 disagree that you answered my question.
- 16 Respectfully, so I'm going to ask it again.
- 17 A. All right.
- 18 Q. Okay. I'm not asking you at all about the
- 19 narrowness of your research, the --
- 20 A. I say broadness. Please, sir.
- 21 Q. Narrowness --
- 22 A. I say broadness.
- 23 Q. Broadness, however you want to characterize it.
- 24 A. I let you get away with narrowness yesterday,
- 25 but I will not any longer.

- 1 Q. Okay. No problem, sir.
- 2 I'm going to re-ask the question. And the
- 3 question ends with asking about will you have the
- 4 integrity to withdraw. And that's the question I
- 5 want you to answer.
- 6 A. I have integrity and my integrity has never been
- 7 challenged. And the fact of the matter is that
- 8 whatever the tobacco industry did or did not do has
- 9 no bearing on my integrity, sir.
- 10 Q. I'd like to re-ask the question that I asked.
- 11 Please listen to the question and answer it.
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 (Record read.)
- 14 THE WITNESS: The answer is no. And it's not a
- 15 question of integrity, it's a question of what my
- 16 research design is. I'll define my integrity, sir.
- 17 And for fifty years I've been working in this
- 18 field. For forty years here at the State of
- 19 Minnesota. No one has ever questioned my integrity,
- 20 sir, and I hope that you won't either.
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. In fifty years you've never been paid by the
- 23 tobacco companies; correct?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. You are being now, correct?

- 1 A. I'm being paid by the tobacco companies through
- 2 the various law firms, yes, sir.
- 3 Q. Correct. In your fifty years in Minnesota
- 4 you've never been paid by tobacco companies, have
- 5 you?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. You've been predominantly paid by the
- 8 University of Minnesota?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. And predominantly paid by labor unions; correct?
- 11 A. No. Not by labor unions.
- 12 Q. By who, besides the University of Minnesota?
- 13 A. I've had research grants from the Minnesota
- 14 Historical Society. I've had research grants from
- 15 the -- from the Bicentennial Commission. I've had
- 16 research grants from various groups like that.
- 17 Q. Predominantly --
- 18 A. And in terms of consulting, I've consulted with
- 19 some law firms.
- 20 Q. Predominantly public institutions that you've
- 21 received your compensation from?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- 23 Q. And in the legal matters that you were involved
- 24 in, that you talked to me about yesterday, they
- 25 involved labor matters?

- 1 A. That is correct.
- 2 Q. And you were on the side of labor?
- 3 A. That is correct.
- 4 Q. And you were paid by the side of labor, correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. So this is the first time in your career, as you
- 7 can recall, that you have testified, or been paid by
- 8 tobacco -- for -- paid by the tobacco companies?
- 9 A. This is the first time, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Now, in addition, sir, if when I show you
- 11 documents -- and I've shown you a few of them
- 12 already, --
- 13 A. Uh-huh.
- 14 Q. -- you see documents that reflect a clear
- 15 pattern of tobacco companies targeting kids, going
- 16 after teenagers, to get them addicted to smoking,
- 17 that reflects a willful pattern on their part, in
- 18 that regard, will you, sir, withdraw as an expert?
- 19 A. No, sir.
- 20 Q. So if that --
- 21 A. For the same reason I gave before.
- 22 Q. I understand.
- Now, you have seen in the course of your
- 24 research public statements by tobacco companies that
- 25 they are not interested in kids and that they don't

- 1 target them; correct? You've seen that?
- 2 A. I've seen such statements, yes, sir.
- 3 Q. And the only things that you've seen to
- 4 contradict that so far are a few documents I showed
- 5 you yesterday; correct?
- 6 A. That is correct.
- 7 Q. The other things you've seen to contradict that
- 8 are the amended complaint that makes allegations,
- 9 quotes from internal documents, that says that that's
- 10 not true, it says that they in fact do target kids;
- 11 correct?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. And, of course, the Richard Kluger book that
- 14 laid out in some detail in its chapters -- a chapter,
- 15 and then touched on in other chapters, in detail that
- 16 in fact they do do this?
- 17 A. I've read that, yes, sir.
- 18 Q. You have read that?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And in spite of reading that book prior to being
- 21 involved in this case, in spite of reading the
- 22 amended complaint which makes allegations that they
- 23 go after the kids, and in spite of seeing just the
- 24 few documents that you saw yesterday that supported
- 25 that -- that you've indicated to me reflect that they

- 1 do go after kids, what you're telling me is that you
- 2 will ignore that issue because you're testifying
- 3 about something else; is that right?
- 4 A. That is absolutely correct. That is what I'm
- 5 saying.
- 6 Q. And you feel that it is fundamentally sound and
- 7 principled for you, as a free academician, to ignore
- 8 an issue like targeting kids, and testify, as you're
- 9 doing here, on behalf of the tobacco companies, with
- 10 money going into your pocket being paid by the
- 11 tobacco companies; correct?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 13 THE WITNESS: I would -- will you please repeat
- 14 that question?
- 15 MR. MANNING: Sure.
- 16 THE WITNESS: That was a long and involved
- 17 question and I want to be sure I know what you're
- 18 saying.
- 19 MR. MANNING: And if it's unclear in any way,
- 20 you can tell me to re-ask it and I'll do so.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Please.
- MR. MANNING: We'll have the reporter re-ask it.
- 23 If it's unclear, please tell me.
- 24 (Record read.)
- THE WITNESS: That's a loaded question. That's

- 1 full of value judgments, full of conclusions. And I
- 2 cannot answer it.
- 3 BY MR. MANNING:
- 4 Q. Why can't you answer the question, sir?
- 5 A. If you will rephrase the question, without using
- 6 value judgments and characterizations, I may be able
- 7 to answer it.
- 8 Q. Okay.
- 9 MR. MANNING: I would ask that counsel instruct
- 10 the witness to answer the question. Value judgments
- 11 are not a legitimate basis for any objection. He
- 12 understands the question. He's indicated that. And
- 13 he's a very bright man. What he's indicated is that
- 14 he's refusing to because of the value judgments.
- I ask you, so I don't have to go to court, to
- 16 instruct the witness to answer the question, as you
- 17 know is proper under the rules.
- 18 MR. PURVIS: I will not so instruct him. And I
- 19 think what the witness is telling you is that he does
- 20 not understand the question.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I do not understand the question,
- 22 sir.
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. That's not what you told me just a moment ago.
- 25 A. Oh, I told you why I didn't understand the

- 1 question. Because it was loaded. And I'd like to
- 2 get a straight question from you, which I'll be able
- 3 to answer. I'll be happy to answer.
- 4 Q. Great. Let's go through what you understand and
- 5 what you don't slowly, okay?
- 6 You understand targeting kids, what I mean by
- 7 that?
- 8 A. I certainly do.
- 9 Q. You understand tobacco companies have denied
- 10 that publicly, you've seen that?
- 11 A. I've seen that, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. You've told me that?
- 13 A. I've told you that.
- 14 Q. Now, what I'm saying -- asking you, sir, is that
- 15 if in fact more evidence comes out than what you've
- 16 already read, about the tobacco companies targeting
- 17 kids, you feel, as an academician, that it is
- 18 acceptable for you, as a free academic of integrity,
- 19 to ignore that issue and testify about something
- 20 else; is that right?
- 21 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- THE WITNESS: In one word, yes.
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. Thank you.
- 25 A. Okay?

- 1 In one word, yes. Okay.
- 2 Q. Now, in addition, when you got on the Internet
- 3 that time, and you found this book, a description of
- 4 the book called "The Cigarette Papers," do you
- 5 remember that?
- 6 A. I do.
- 7 Q. And do you remember that it was written by
- 8 Stanton Glantz, John Slade, Lisa Bero, Peter Hanauer
- 9 and Deborah Barnes?
- 10 A. I don't recall the authors.
- 11 Q. Do you remember that there was a forward by
- 12 C. Everett Koop in it?
- 13 A. It's possible that that was -- that was on the
- 14 Internet. I don't recall.
- MR. PURVIS: Just a minute. I'm going to object
- 16 to any reference to a book that you have not put on
- 17 your predesignation list. The order is very clear
- 18 that you may not even refer to such a book.
- MR. MANNING: That's absurd.
- 20 MR. PURVIS: I'm handing you the order. And, in
- 21 fact, I'll read it to you. It says, "No later than
- 22 five business days before the date of the deposition
- 23 the party noticing the deposition shall serve on the
- 24 opposing party a list of all documents with which
- 25 that party, or any other party aligned with that

- 1 party, then intends to show the witness, mark as an
- 2 exhibit at the deposition, or otherwise refer to at
- 3 the deposition."
- 4 You are referring to a book that has not been
- 5 predesignated and it's improper examination.
- 6 MR. MANNING: Do you want to call the judge?
- 7 MR. PURVIS: Sure.
- 8 MR. MANNING: Let's call him.
- 9 MR. PURVIS: It's in the order.
- 10 MR. MANNING: I want to make the record real
- 11 clear before I call the judge, so we're clear.
- 12 This witness has indicated that he got on the
- 13 Internet and reviewed, not the book, but many
- 14 statements about the book, excerpts, et cetera. He
- 15 indicated that yesterday.
- 16 Now I could hardly designate that book in
- 17 advance because I did not know that he had done
- 18 that. I have not marked the book, nor have I put the
- 19 book in front of him.
- I have the book in the room and I intend to
- 21 explore the level of this witness's memory with
- 22 respect to the topics of the book and what he chose
- 23 not to read. And I am more than happy to have a call
- 24 with the Court to discuss this.
- MR. PURVIS: The record will clearly reflect

- 1 that yesterday you raised the topic of this book.
- 2 You referred to it improperly at that time and now
- 3 you're trying to refer to it again in more detail,
- 4 which is contrary to the order that I just read to
- 5 you.
- 6 MR. MANNING: I didn't refer to it improperly.
- 7 I asked him what he reviewed. He told me it was page
- 8 one through thirty-seven. I referred to other
- 9 sources and shockingly, major sources of information
- 10 he acknowledged being aware of, but did not put in
- 11 his report.
- 12 So I'm more than happy to take it up with the
- 13 Court and I'd be happy to do so right now. So -- I
- 14 don't know the Court's number. I'll need to take a
- 15 break and call back to my office and then I'll be
- 16 prepared to call the Court.
- 17 (Recess taken.)
- 18 MR. PURVIS: For the record, the defense counsel
- 19 have conferred. We believe our position is well
- 20 taken on this point, pursuant to the order; however,
- 21 in the interest of accommodating plaintiffs' counsel,
- 22 we will reserve the objection and allow counsel to
- 23 proceed.
- MR. MANNING: And I won't waste any more time on
- 25 the record by way of a response. The objection is

- 1 reserved, so any response to it I will do at a later
- 2 time and develop it in more detail as to what's in
- 3 the record and what's outside the record. But I
- 4 appreciate that, counsel, and I'll move on.
- 5 BY MR. MANNING:
- 6 Q. Sir, when you were on the Internet, you didn't
- 7 take this -- when you were looking at this book, "The
- 8 Cigarette Papers," or a description of it on the
- 9 Internet, you didn't print it out?
- 10 A. No, sir.
- 11 Q. You were just looking at it on your screen?
- 12 A. That is correct, sir.
- 13 Q. Did you do a search, cigarettes, cigarette
- 14 documents? How did you find this on the Internet?
- 15 A. I really don't -- yes. I do recall now. There
- 16 was under either the CNN -- CNN com a statement of
- 17 tobacco-related articles or whatever.
- 18 Tobacco-related things. I punched that.
- 19 Q. And this --
- 20 A. And, among other things, this came up.
- 21 Q. Do you recall any of the other things that came
- 22 up besides this?
- 23 A. No, I don't, offhand.
- 24 Q. Did tobacco company documents themselves come
- 25 up?

- 1 A. No, sir.
- 2 Q. Did you --
- 3 A. At least they didn't come up in that initial
- 4 push of the mouse button.
- 5 Q. Do you recall having access, if you had gone a
- 6 little further, there was a description that in fact
- 7 you could have gone further and in fact seen actual
- 8 tobacco company documents?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. You saw that that was possible?
- 11 A. That was possible.
- 12 Q. And you chose not to do that?
- 13 A. I chose not to do so.
- 14 Q. You reviewed all these press articles, on pages
- 15 one through thirty-seven, and other things listed
- 16 here, but even though you had tobacco company
- 17 documents available to you by a click of the mouse,
- 18 you didn't look at them?
- 19 A. That is correct.
- 20 Q. You did look at this book, "The Cigarette
- 21 Papers"?
- 22 A. I did not look at the book.
- 23 Q. You looked at excerpts, a description of it?
- 24 A. I looked at the description of it in terms of
- 25 what it included, yes, sir.

- 1 Q. Okay. And is, in part, what you saw, see if
- 2 this refreshes your memory, this: "On May 12, 1994, a
- 3 package containing four thousand pages of secret
- 4 internal tobacco industry documents arrived at the
- 5 office of Professor Stanton Glantz at the University
- 6 of California, San Francisco. The anonymous
- 7 source of these, quote, cigarette papers, unquote,
- 8 was identified in the return address only as
- 9 'Mr. Butts'--presumably a reference to the
- 10 Doonesbury cartoon character. These documents
- 11 provide a shocking inside account of the activities
- 12 of one tobacco company, Brown & Williamson, and its
- 13 multinational parent, British American Tobacco, over
- 14 more than thirty years. Since their disclosure they
- 15 have been the subject of headlines around the world.
- 16 They are also reported" -- "...they are also reported
- 17 to have influenced President Clinton's decision to
- 18 direct the Food and Drug Administration to regulate
- 19 cigarettes as a nicotine delivery device."
- Is that, in part, some of the things you read?
- 21 A. I don't recall whether I read that particular
- 22 statement on that -- at that particular time. But
- 23 the content of what you read me I have learned either
- 24 through that source or through some other readings.
- 25 Q. What other readings have you learned that --

- 1 A. Newspaper accounts.
- 2 Q. Newspaper accounts of this book?
- 3 A. That is correct, yes.
- 4 Q. What newspaper accounts?
- 5 A. New York Times, I assume.
- 6 Q. They're not, per se, listed here?
- 7 A. No. Post 1995 books. That stuff is not listed
- 8 here.
- 9 Q. Okay. So you knew then, from whatever source it
- 10 was, that documents or excerpts, at least, of
- 11 documents contained in this book, were things that
- 12 had influenced President Clinton's --
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. -- decision to direct the FDA to regulate
- 15 cigarettes as a nicotine delivery device?
- 16 A. I don't recall if I knew that specific thing.
- 17 But I do recall seeing that it had some influence,
- 18 yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Okay. Do you recall seeing that, "Now 'The
- 20 Cigarette Papers,'" this book, "...provides the
- 21 definitive examination of these striking documents,
- 22 combined with other material subpoenaed by Congress
- 23 and obtained by Professor Glantz. Quoting
- 24 extensively from the papers and adding needed
- 25 background and context, this book offers a keyhole

- 1 view of the tobacco industry promising to
- 2 fundamentally change the public's perception of the
- 3 industry, of tobacco litigation, and of public policy
- 4 making"; did you see that?
- 5 A. I don't recall seeing that, no, sir.
- 6 Q. Do you recall seeing something to that effect?
- 7 A. Something to that effect, perhaps.
- 8 Q. But you knew that this book was, in fact, going
- 9 to -- was claimed to have the potential of
- 10 fundamentally impacting public's perception of the
- 11 tobacco industry?
- 12 A. I don't know if I knew that from that Internet
- 13 encounter, or it came to my attention through other
- 14 sources.
- 15 Q. But you knew that?
- 16 A. Yes, sir.
- 17 Q. And one of the things that you've been
- 18 interested in and concerned with, as a historian, is
- 19 the public's perception?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- 21 Q. That is what you are attempting to offer
- 22 opinions on?
- 23 A. That is correct.
- 24 Q. And so this -- this landmark-sort-of-event of
- 25 the publication of this book, and its ability and the

- 1 content -- the ability of its contents to influence
- 2 public perception, you are aware of, but once again
- 3 chose not to read?
- 4 A. That is correct.
- 5 Q. Did you know that the book was written by
- 6 experts with the scientific and legal knowledge to
- 7 understand the meaning of the documents and explain
- 8 their importance?
- 9 A. No.
- 10 Q. Did you know and see that it was claimed that in
- 11 this book that it showed that the tobacco industry's
- 12 conduct has been more cynical and devious than even
- 13 its harshest critics had suspected? Did you read
- 14 something to that effect?
- 15 A. I may have seen something to that effect, yes.
- 16 Q. Did you see that what was claimed by these
- 17 papers, that for more than three decades the industry
- 18 had internally acknowledged that smoking is addictive
- 19 and that use of tobacco products causes disease and
- 20 death, and despite this acknowledgment, based on the
- 21 industry's own internal and contract research, the
- 22 industry has engaged in a variety of tactics to deny
- 23 its own findings and to convince the public that
- 24 there is still doubt about the harmful effects of
- 25 tobacco or that the effects have been exaggerated.

- 1 You knew --
- 2 A. I'm not sure whether I saw that in this
- 3 connection, but that general kind of theme runs
- 4 through the literature and the news accounts and the
- 5 public accounts of the last couple of years, yes,
- 6 sir.
- 7 Q. And even though you may intend to do more
- 8 reading to attempt to add to your opinion, as you
- 9 described to me yesterday, you still have no
- 10 intention of reading tobacco company documents?
- 11 A. That is absolutely correct.
- 12 Q. You have no intention of asking these lawyers
- 13 for the real documents, so you wouldn't have to rely
- 14 on books like "The Cigarette Papers" or "From Ashes
- 15 to Ashes"?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 17 BY MR. MANNING:
- 18 Q. Correct?
- 19 A. No, I will not.
- 20 Q. You, sir, believe that as -- as a historian,
- 21 that children need to be treated with extra care?
- 22 A. As a historian, I have no opinion on that.
- 23 Q. As an individual do you believe that?
- 24 A. I certainly do.
- 25 Q. The reason for that is that children are

- 1 vulnerable?
- 2 A. I'm sorry.
- 3 Q. One of the reasons for that is that children are
- 4 vulnerable?
- 5 A. My own view on this?
- 6 Q. Yes.
- 7 A. My personal view on this?
- 8 Q. Yes.
- 9 A. That children have to be protected, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Right.
- 11 A. Because of vulnerability, et cetera, yes.
- 12 Q. And you yourself would not want to be a part of
- 13 anything that was not protecting children, would you?
- 14 A. Of course not.
- 15 Q. You would only want to be a part of things that
- 16 were supportive of children?
- 17 A. Of course not.
- 18 Q. Of course what?
- 19 A. I'm sorry. What was the question, please?
- 20 Q. You would only want to be a part of things that
- 21 were supportive of children?
- 22 A. Oh, yes, I absolutely would. I'm sorry, I
- 23 misheard you.
- 24 Q. That's all right.
- Now showing you what's been previously marked as

- 1 Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 304, --
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. -- this is a document titled a, "Report on a
- 4 Visit to U.S.A. and Canada, "April 17th to May 12,
- 5 1958, by three gentlemen; right?
- 6 A. That's what it says on the cover.
- 7 Q. And it's a BAT Company LTD document on the
- 8 bottom; is that correct?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. And if we can turn to the second page -- next
- 11 page, if you will, --
- 12 A. (Complying.)
- 13 Q. -- of the document under "'Causation' of
- 14 Lung Cancer, " --
- 15 A. Uh-huh.
- 16 Q. -- it says here, "With one exception (H.S.N.
- 17 Greene) the individuals whom we met believed that
- 18 smoking causes lung cancer if by 'causation' we mean
- 19 any chain of events which leads finally to lung
- 20 cancer and which involves smoking as an indispensable
- 21 link"; do you see that statement?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 Q. Now at least that sentence would appear to
- 24 indicate that there is knowledge in 1958 that smoking
- 25 causes lung cancer; true?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. That is right.
- 2 Q. You would agree with that as a historian?
- 3 A. From the interpretation of that, yes.
- 4 Q. And if I can turn all the way back to page eight
- 5 of this document, please.
- 6 A. Page?
- 7 Q. Eight.
- 8 A. Eight?
- 9 Q. Yeah.
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Item number one under "Conclusions"; "Although
- 12 there remains some doubt as to the proportion of the
- 13 total lung cancer mortality which can fairly be
- 14 attributed to smoking, scientific opinion in U.S.A.
- 15 does not now seriously doubt that the statistical
- 16 correlation is real and reflects a cause-and-effect
- 17 relationship"; do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. No doubt about this --
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. -- any longer from a historian's perspective
- 22 causing cancer?
- 23 A. From a historian's perspective I agree that is a
- 24 fact, sure. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. So this internal document here that we've just

- 1 looked at, then, just confirms in your mind what
- 2 you've already indicated; that is, that as early as
- 3 1958, and possibly earlier, tobacco companies knew
- 4 beyond a shadow of a doubt, as you told me yesterday,
- 5 that cigarette smoking causes cancer?
- 6 A. I never said tobacco companies knew. I don't
- 7 know what the tobacco companies knew. I'm just
- 8 telling you what I know.
- 9 Q. What you know --
- 10 A. What I know as a historian.
- 11 Q. Okay.
- 12 A. Now, --
- 13 Q. Now --
- 14 A. Now --
- 15 Q. Go ahead.
- 16 A. No, I'm sorry.
- 17 Q. Now, in looking at this document, which is a
- 18 tobacco company document, at least this tobacco
- 19 company, you now know, knew as well?
- 20 A. That's what this states, yes.
- 21 Q. And if this tobacco company was in fact on a
- 22 trip where it was communicating with all other
- 23 tobacco companies, and talking with them and learning
- 24 from them about exactly what their view was on this
- 25 issue, and then they were reporting on it in this

- 1 memo, then it may in fact reflect the knowledge of
- 2 all the tobacco companies; correct?
- 3 A. It may, yes.
- 4 Q. So this is now the first time that you're aware,
- 5 as you look at this document, from a private source,
- 6 that in fact tobacco companies knew? As a historian,
- 7 you're now aware of that?
- 8 A. Oh, as an individual or a historian. Yes.
- 9 Q. Either one?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. Individual or historian, --
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. -- you're now aware, having reviewed this
- 14 document?
- 15 A. Yes.
- 16 Q. Thank you.
- 17 What you're aware of is what you knew from
- 18 public sources, but you now know from a private
- 19 source?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- 21 Q. I'm just going to stack these, keep them in some
- 22 order for ease of -- do it that way, if it's all
- 23 right.
- I show you, sir, what's been marked as
- 25 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1050, and this is a document --

- 1 the author is Alan Rodgman, correct? Up on the top?
- 2 A. I'm sorry. Alan? I can't make out the second
- 3 name.
- 4 Q. You can see the G-M-A-N?
- 5 A. I see the G-M-A-N, yes, sir.
- 6 Q. Says, "Division: Chemical Research"?
- 7 A. Says, "Divisi- Chemical Research"; I assume that
- 8 to be "Division: Chemical Research."
- 9 Q. That's 1962 there?
- 10 A. Is that "RDM" coma?
- 11 Q. Yes, sir.
- 12 A. 1962, yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And on the right it has "Previous Reports: '54,
- 14 '55, '56, '59"; do you see that?
- 15 A. I see that.
- 16 Q. And then the title of it is: "The Smoking and
- 17 Health Problem, A Critical and Objective Appraisal";
- 18 do you see that?
- 19 A. Yes, I do.
- 20 Q. You're welcome to read any portion of this,
- 21 always, but for time constraints here --
- 22 A. Surely.
- 23 Q. -- I'm going down to the memorandum section.
- 24 A. Sure.
- 25 Q. The second sentence from the last it says,

- 1 "During the past two decades, cigarette smoke has
- 2 been the target of a host of studies relating it to
- 3 ill health and particularly lung cancer"; do you see
- 4 that?
- 5 A. Yes, I do.
- 6 Q. "The majority of these studies incriminate
- 7 cigarette smoke from a health viewpoint"; do you see
- 8 that?
- 9 A. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. On to the next page. Under "Epidemiological
- 11 Data" it says, "The results of thirty-four different
- 12 statistical studies show that cigarette smoking
- 13 increases the risk of developing lung cancer. Many
- 14 authorities believe the relationship to be one of
- 15 cause and effect"; do you see that?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- 17 Q. Down to the next -- skipping the next paragraph,
- 18 the next one.
- 19 "The statistical data from the smoking health
- 20 studies are almost universally accepted. After more
- 21 than ten years criticisms of the studies have been
- 22 reduced to the dictum a statistical study cannot
- 23 prove a cause-and-effect relationship between two
- 24 factors"; do you see that?
- 25 A. I do.

- 1 Q. Now, once again, you would, as a historian, in
- 2 looking at this document, considering it to be a
- 3 document that was produced by RJR or the Reynolds
- 4 company, you're familiar with that; right?
- 5 A. Yes, I am.
- 6 Q. That at least in 1962, as this author was
- 7 reflecting back, you as a historian would, again,
- 8 interpret that there's knowledge here on behalf of
- 9 this tobacco company, at a minimum, that beyond a
- 10 shadow of a doubt it causes cancer?
- 11 A. This is what the document indicates, yes.
- 12 Q. Correct.
- 13 A. Or the sections of the document that you read.
- 14 Q. Right.
- 15 If we even go further to page four, if you will,
- 16 the author talks about "The Evidence to Date"; do you
- 17 see that?
- 18 A. Evidence to date, yes, sir.
- 19 Q. It says, "Obviously, the amount of evidence
- 20 accumulated to indict cigarette smoke as a health
- 21 hazard is overwhelming"; right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. And, again, that just confirms your viewpoint of
- 24 it being beyond a shadow of a doubt. They themselves
- 25 are saying it's overwhelming; --

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Right?
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. "The evidence challenging this indictment is
- 5 scant. Attempts to shift the blame to other factors,
- 6 for example, air pollutants, necessitates acceptance
- 7 of data similar to those denied in the cigarette
- 8 smoke case"; do you see that?
- 9 A. I do.
- 10 Q. And then if we go to the top of page five --
- 11 starts there, says, "... and Kotin, member of" -- see
- 12 where I am?
- 13 A. I'm sorry. I can't find it.
- 14 Q. Top of page five, right on the right-hand side.
- 15 Says, "... and Kotin, a member of the Scientific
- 16 Advisory Board, TIRC, stated, quote, 'The
- 17 statement...to the effect that the sum total of
- 18 scientific evidence establishes beyond reasonable
- 19 doubt that cigarette smoke is a causal factor in the
- 20 rapidly increasing incidence of human epidermal --
- 21 epidermoid cancer of the lung' represents a view with
- 22 which we concur"; do you see that?
- 23 A. I see that.
- 24 Q. And once again almost in your same words, when
- 25 you said beyond a shadow of a doubt, here's a

- 1 statement in a Reynolds' document that's using almost
- 2 those same words, beyond a reasonable doubt, that
- 3 it's been established?
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. That, in fact, cigarette smoking causes cancer?
- 6 A. That's what this document shows, yes, sir.
- 7 Q. And so now we know, also as a historian, that
- 8 any statements that equivocate --
- 9 I remember earlier you told me that you
- 10 determined that tobacco companies pre-'55, they
- 11 lied, or after '55 they either lied or equivocated?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. Now we would at least know, as -- from a
- 14 historical perspective, and as a historian, that in
- 15 review of these documents that whatever they said to
- 16 the public wasn't an accurate equivocation? It was
- 17 in fact a lie, correct?
- 18 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 19 BY MR. MANNING:
- 20 Q. You would know that as a historian?
- 21 A. I would not know that as a historian. I would
- 22 have to have a much more kind of comprehensive
- 23 examination of the documents to make that kind of
- 24 determination. I'd have to have the providence of
- 25 the documents checked. I'd have to have the

- 1 reliability of the writers checked. In other words,
- 2 on the basis of what you read me, I would have to
- 3 say, probably. But I would have to -- but now, as an
- 4 individual, not as a historian, doing research, as a
- 5 historian doing research, I would need these other
- 6 things. But that would be a different research
- 7 topic.
- 8 Q. I understand.
- 9 And a research topic that you could do?
- 10 A. But I chose not to do so.
- 11 Q. I understand that full well.
- 12 But one you could do?
- 13 A. One I could do? Certainly I could do it.
- 14 Q. You certainly could.
- And so we're clear what you're saying: You're
- 16 telling me that probably it's true that there's no --
- 17 that it's not accurate to equivocate when you see
- 18 documents like this? Probably it's true that they
- 19 were lying?
- 20 A. Probably.
- 21 Q. But you, as a matter of being an accurate
- 22 historian, would want to go back and confirm the
- 23 sources of these documents?
- 24 A. If I were doing that research project, yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Right.

- 1 And when you confirm the sources of accounts in
- 2 the press, all you do -- you don't -- you just read
- 3 the press article? You don't go back -- on your
- 4 pages one through thirty-seven, the great bulk of
- 5 what you read there was press articles, right?
- 6 A. That's correct.
- 7 Q. And you don't go back and confirm those sources?
- 8 A. No, sir.
- 9 Q. No. You rely on whoever that journalist and
- 10 that editor was who said whatever they said on that
- 11 particular day in that paper?
- 12 A. No, sir. Not -- not alone. Not exclusively.
- 13 Q. What else?
- 14 A. The check on the veracity of what appears in the
- 15 press is, of course, other press sources.
- 16 Q. Uh-huh.
- 17 A. What appears in the press, the veracity of that
- 18 is a check against the New York Times Index. A check
- 19 against other non-press sources. In other words, it
- 20 isn't only the press alone that is the source of
- 21 veracity for providence.
- 22 Q. Yeah.
- 23 A. It's largely the press, to be sure.
- 24 Q. Right.
- Does it surprise you that the statements here

- 1 are made so clearly about the tobacco companies'
- 2 knowledge of the causative effect of cigarette
- 3 smoking and cancer?
- 4 A. Does it surprise me?
- 5 MR. PURVIS: Objection to form.
- 6 BY MR. MANNING:
- 7 Q. Yes, sir?
- 8 A. No, sir.
- 9 Q. It doesn't surprise you?
- 10 A. No.
- 11 Q. What you suspected all along?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. Pardon me?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. Set that aside, if you'd like.
- 16 A. You're through with this one?
- 17 Q. Yes, sir.
- 18 (Exhibit 3139 marked for identification.)
- 19 BY MR. MANNING:
- 20 Q. Now, sir, I'm showing you a three-page
- 21 document. If you look on the third page, --
- 22 A. Which page?
- 23 Q. The third page.
- 24 A. Third. Uh-huh.
- 25 Q. It's been marked as Exhibit 3139 and it's a

- 1 letter from Mr. Paul H. Hahn, who is the -- titled as
- 2 the President, to Timothy V. Hartnett, the Chairman
- 3 of the Tobacco Industry Research Committee. Do you
- 4 see that?
- 5 A. Yes, I do.
- 6 Q. In the first paragraph -- and it's dated 1962,
- 7 October; right?
- 8 A. Uh-huh. That's right.
- 9 Q. What it says -- it says, "At the joint meeting,"
- 10 in the first paragraph, "of the Executive Committees
- 11 of the TIRC and Tobacco Institute on Wednesday of
- 12 last week, there was discussion of a recommendation
- 13 that the tobacco industry should, in paid
- 14 advertising, state its position that the charges
- 15 against cigarettes as a health hazard do not
- 16 constitute a 'closed case' against smoking"; do you
- 17 see that?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. And you now see here documents in writing by a
- 20 fellow named Hahn who refers to himself as the
- 21 President, to Hartnett, the chairman of the Tobacco
- 22 Industry Research Committee, stating things in
- 23 writing about what they should do in advertising that
- 24 are contradictory of internal documents that you've
- 25 already seen as a historian; correct?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. Contradictory to which --
- 2 Q. Contradictory to the last few documents that I
- 3 showed you that, in fact, cigarette smoking does
- 4 cause cancer?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Correct?
- 7 A. But, remember, I characterize their response --
- 8 public response as equivocation.
- 9 Q. I understand.
- 10 A. I characterize their public response as
- 11 equivocation. And this does, in fact, confirm
- 12 that --
- 13 Q. Confirm --
- 14 A. -- equivocation.
- 15 Q. Confirms that their public response was
- 16 intentional equivocation?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. And this confirms that in your mind?
- 19 A. Yes, sir. Right.
- 20 Q. But intentional equivocation -- their public
- 21 response being intentional equivocation contradicts
- 22 the clarity of the internal documents expressing
- 23 their knowledge that cigarette smoking causes cancer?
- 24 A. From the two documents I read, yes. Or two
- 25 documents, excerpts of which you read me.

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Q. Correct.
- 2 A. I want to be accurate on this, now.
- 3 Q. And then the next paragraph, it says,
- 4 "Differences of opinion were expressed at the
- 5 meeting"; right?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Through with this?
- 8 Q. Please.
- 9 (Exhibit 3140 marked for identification.)
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as Document
- 12 3140, that appears to be a six-page document, and
- 13 it's from a Frank J. Welch to the Tobacco Institute
- 14 Membership; right?
- 15 A. Let me just check who the --
- 16 Q. It's on the front. I'm sorry.
- 17 A. Oh, it's on the front. I'm sorry.
- 18 Q. That's all right.
- 19 A. Frank J. Welch. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And it's on the Tobacco Institute, Washington,
- 21 D.C., stationery; right?
- 22 A. That is correct.
- 23 Q. Dated February 4, '65?
- 24 A. That is right.
- 25 Q. And the subject is "State Legislative Matters";

- 1 do you see that?
- 2 A. So it states.
- 3 Q. And it says that, "This is a progress report on
- 4 bills pertaining to tobacco, other than tax bills,
- 5 that have been introduced in the indicated respective
- 6 legislatures and the current status of each of these
- 7 bills"; do you see that?
- 8 A. Yes. Yes.
- 9 Q. And it goes through state by state, doesn't it?
- 10 A. That's correct.
- 11 Q. And it's to the Tobacco Institute Membership,
- 12 and we don't know all of who that entails, at least
- 13 by this document, do we?
- 14 A. No.
- 15 Q. We at least note Minnesota as number three;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. That's right. Third on the list of states, yes.
- 18 Q. And it says, "The five bills introduced in
- 19 Minnesota are now pending before Committees."
- 20 A. That's right.
- 21 Q. It says, "We, of course, are diligently working
- 22 toward keeping these bills from getting out of
- 23 Committees"?
- 24 A. That's what it says.
- 25 Q. Okay. Once again in the course of your work you

- 1 never asked these lawyers from Shook, Hardy and
- 2 Bacon, or any of these other lawyers, to show you the
- 3 internal documents that would bear on issues of
- 4 lobbying that may bear directly on legislation and
- 5 committee meetings that you were listening to, did
- 6 you?
- 7 A. No, sir, I did not.
- 8 Q. And we now at least know by this document, that
- 9 at least as early as 1965 that the Tobacco Institute
- 10 in Minnesota was working diligently; correct?
- 11 A. That's what the document states.
- 12 Q. And historically that's interesting information,
- 13 isn't it?
- 14 A. But not unusual.
- 15 Q. No. I understand that.
- 16 A. And not surprising.
- 17 Q. Not surprising. We acknowledged that
- 18 yesterday.
- 19 And, in fact, may have even occurred earlier
- 20 than 1965; right?
- 21 A. Sure. And later, as well.
- 22 Q. And later, as well.
- 23 A. That's it?
- 24 Q. Yes, sir.
- 25 (Exhibit 3141 marked for identification.)

- 1 BY MR. MANNING:
- 2 Q. Next I'm showing you a document, sir, that's
- 3 been marked as Exhibit 3141, right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. It's titled -- first of all, in the left-hand
- 6 corner it says "Strictly Confidential"; right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 Q. "Smoking and Health: The Present Position in
- 9 the U.K. and How It Came About"; right?
- 10 A. Yes. That's the title.
- 11 Q. And it then says, "The Present Position: The
- 12 Main Evidence Against Smoking"; right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And it says the following -- I'd like you to
- 15 read along with me and we'll interrupt sentence by
- 16 sentence.
- 17 "We all like to think of ourselves as men who
- 18 have the moral strength to face facts..."
- 19 We do like to think of ourselves that way, is
- 20 that right?
- 21 A. That's what it says.
- 22 Q. "...even if they are unpleasant facts"; right?
- 23 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 24 Q. "So I am going to start," and I'm reading from
- 25 the document here, "by asking you to face certain

- 1 facts, certain vital statistics. When I mention the
- 2 words, quote, 'vital statistics,' end quote, some of
- 3 my friends immediately think of figures like
- 4 38-24-36."
- 5 That's not really very funny, is it, sir?
- 6 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 7 THE WITNESS: I have no idea -- oh, I see. I'm
- 8 sorry. Yes. I see what it's referring to. I'm slow
- 9 today. Sorry about that.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. No problem.
- 12 "The vital statistics I would like you to bear
- 13 in mind are 7, 57, 139 and 227. There is no glamour
- 14 about these figures. They are the death rates per
- 15 hundred thousand per year from cancer of the lung of
- 16 men who were nonsmokers (they are 7), men who smoked
- $17\,\,$ one to fourteen cigarettes daily (they are $57)\,,$ men
- 18 who smoked fifteen to twenty-four cigarettes daily
- 19 (they are 139) and men who smoke twenty-five or more
- 20 cigarettes daily (they are 227). These figures are
- 21 all included in table one, which you have before
- 22 you."
- 23 Do you see that?
- 24 A. Yes, I do.
- 25 Q. So, in fact, this document lays out the death

- 1 march numbers that were referred to yesterday that we
- 2 looked at in the amended complaint, doesn't it?
- 3 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 4 BY MR. MANNING:
- 5 Q. Doesn't it?
- 6 A. Those numbers I'm not sure, but I've seen
- 7 numbers similar to those. I don't know where they're
- 8 taken from.
- 9 Q. Well, you saw the phrase yesterday that I read
- 10 to you in the amended complaint, that this industry
- 11 is essentially on a death march?
- 12 A. I saw that in the complaint, yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And this document reflects on "The Present
- 14 Position: The Main Evidence Against Smoking, " that
- 15 at least the people who drafted this document and who
- 16 it was sent to, as an internal tobacco document, are
- 17 specifically aware of the numbers of cigarettes
- 18 smoked, correlated to the number of deaths as it
- 19 relates to people marching to death; correct?
- 20 A. That is what this document says.
- 21 Q. Okay.
- 22 A. Except it doesn't have the term marching to
- 23 death.
- 24 Q. Right.
- In the next paragraph, the last sentence, it

- 1 says --
- 2 A. Next paragraph, last sentence. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. The second-to-the-last sentence?
- 4 A. Second-to-the-last sentence.
- 5 "These vital statistics are really vital. They
- 6 threaten the life of the tobacco industry in every
- 7 country of the world."
- 8 Q. That's what it says.
- 9 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Then we go to the second page, top there. It
- 11 says "Epidemiology" in quotes; do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. "Simply means the science of diseases found in a
- 14 large number of people." Are you familiar with that
- 15 definition?
- 16 A. Yes, I am.
- 17 Q. "Epidemiology is a particular form of applied
- 18 statistics"; right?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. "A very large number of epidemiological studies
- 21 of smoking and disease have now been carried out in
- 22 many countries of the world."
- 23 A. Except here it's singular.
- 24 Q. "...country of the world," correct.
- 25 A. Yes.

- 1 Q. "There are well over fifty good quality
- 2 epidemiological studies of smoking and lung cancer
- 3 and they all reached similar conclusions. If the
- 4 epidemiological studies of smoking and other diseases
- 5 are added in, the total runs into hundreds. But the
- 6 total is not important. One good, conclusive study
- 7 is enough -- unfortunately."
- 8 A. That's what it says.
- 9 Q. And again this paragraph, what it does is
- 10 confirms those words you used yesterday of beyond a
- 11 shadow of a doubt they knew it caused cancer?
- 12 A. That's correct.
- 13 Q. And it confirms those words we saw in this
- 14 document right here today, it said beyond reasonable
- 15 doubt it causes cancer?
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. And it confirms their explicit knowledge of
- 18 that?
- 19 A. So this indicates, yes, sir.
- 20 Q. And you would conclude that as a historian as
- 21 you review that document; correct?
- 22 A. If I were doing such historical work, yes. But
- 23 I am not.
- 24 Q. I understand.
- 25 A. But I would need more evidence than this,

- 1 unfortunately or fortunately.
- 2 Q. You may put that down.
- 3 A. (Complying).
- 4 Q. Sir, I'm going to show you what's been marked
- 5 down there at the bottom as Plaintiffs' Exhibit
- 6 Number 439; do you see that?
- 7 A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. This is now a document that is a BAT Company LTD
- 9 document, right, as stated on the bottom?
- 10 A. On the bottom, yes.
- 11 Q. And at the top left it says "Secret"; right?
- 12 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 13 Q. The title of it is "Appreciation"; right?
- 14 A. Sorry?
- 15 Q. The title says "Appreciation"?
- 16 A. "Appreciation," yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Number one, it says "AIM"; right?
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. It says, "To become stronger in tobacco, as a
- 20 sound basis for further diversification."
- 21 A. That's what it says.
- 22 Q. That's the aim of this?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. We can turn, sir, to the second page, okay?
- 25 A. Second page?

- 1 Q. Yes, sir.
- 2 A. Okay.
- 3 Q. Under item "l" it says, "We have three pending
- 4 legal suits against Brown and Williamson in the
- 5 U.S.A. and U.S. lawyers are waiting for an
- 6 opportunity to demonstrate that the industry accepts
- 7 causation in order to succeed in their suits"; do you
- 8 see that?
- 9 A. I do see that, yes.
- 10 Q. The next item, "m": "The company's position on
- 11 causation is simply not believed by the overwhelming
- 12 majority of independent observers, scientists, and
- 13 doctors; right?
- 14 A. That's correct.
- 15 Q. You were one of those people who didn't believe
- 16 the company's position?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- 18 Q. You were like the scientists or doctors, you
- 19 said either they're lying, or they're equivocating;
- 20 right?
- 21 A. And most of the public, as well.
- 22 Q. I understand that's your view.
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. Now, and at least here your belief in the lying
- 25 and equivocation is supported by the internal

- 1 document of the company; correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. They, the internal people at the company here,
- 4 are acknowledging that they know that people like you
- 5 thought they were lying; right?
- 6 A. So item "m" indicates.
- 7 Q. Okay. And so in item "o" it says, "The industry
- 8 is unable to argue satisfactorily for its own
- 9 continued existence because all arguments eventually
- 10 lead back to the primary issue of causation and on
- 11 this point our position is unacceptable"; correct?
- 12 A. That's what it states, yes.
- 13 Q. So now you have an internal document here that
- 14 you're reviewing for the first time that, in fact,
- 15 says that they're aware that their position is
- 16 unacceptable?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Reviewing in part. The excerpts that you're
- 19 reading for me.
- 20 Q. Absolutely.
- 21 A. I want that to be clear for the record.
- 22 Q. And you can have that as something that's
- 23 throughout clear. Because I can't show you millions
- 24 of documents.
- 25 A. I understand that, sir.

- 1 Q. I can't even show you thousands of documents in
- 2 maybe the three or four hours that I have left to
- 3 question you.
- 4 A. I understand that, sir.
- 5 Q. But we'll do as much historical analysis as we
- 6 can in the time remaining; okay?
- 7 A. No, we will not, because that is not what I am
- 8 here to do, historical analysis of these documents.
- 9 We will do analysis of the documents, of me
- 10 hearing them for the first time as an individual.
- 11 Not as an expert, not as historian, but as an
- 12 individual.
- 13 Q. Okay. Well, we'll talk about that, I'm sure.
- Would you then turn to page three, sir.
- 15 Item "d"?
- 16 A. Item?
- 17 Q. "d"?
- 18 A. "d"?
- 19 Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. It says, "The tobacco industry is the only
- 21 organization or group of organizations which have the
- 22 motivation, potential communications expertise, and
- 23 financial resources to mount a campaign to redress
- 24 the balance which is central to long-term survival";
- 25 do you see that?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. Yes, I do see that.
- 2 Q. Item "e" says, "No individual can argue
- 3 successfully unless his integrity is unquestionable.
- 4 In the view of the forces ranged against us, our
- 5 integrity is seriously in question over our position
- 6 on causation."
- 7 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. Acknowledges, once again, what you already knew?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. Item "f" -- but what you already knew, so we're
- 11 clear, you knew as a historian?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Right.
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. And this acknowledges, this document, what you
- 16 already knew?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. On item "f" it says, "Our position on causation,
- 19 which we have maintained for some twenty years in
- 20 order to defend our industry, is in danger of
- 21 becoming the very factor which inhibits our long-term
- 22 viability"; do you see that?
- 23 A. I do see that.
- 24 Q. Item "g". "It could be that a re-evaluation has
- 25 to be made of what we could lose in the short term

- 1 through court action in the U.S.A., against what we
- 2 will certainly lose in the long-term if we do not
- 3 defend ourselves credibly on social unacceptability";
- 4 do you see that?
- 5 A. I do.
- 6 Q. So there appears to be a weighing of the truth
- 7 and telling the truth versus a quote, "legal
- 8 position, " doesn't there?
- 9 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Correct?
- 12 A. I can't say what the balance of views here are.
- 13 I have no way of knowing that from this particular
- 14 statement.
- 15 Q. You can't determine that from that?
- 16 A. I can't determine that.
- 17 Q. No problem.
- Well, let's go to the next page. On page four,
- 19 okay?
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. It says, "Courses Open To Us."
- 22 "We can continue to maintain our present
- 23 position on causation." And then it lists the
- 24 advantages under that, right?
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. One advantage is "Our legal position in the
- 2 U.S.A. will remain intact, as far as we have been
- 3 advised"; right?
- 4 A. I see that.
- 5 Q. Must have been advised by the lawyers, don't you
- 6 think?
- 7 A. I assume so.
- 8 Q. Yeah.
- 9 So they're telling them, "Don't worry, we can
- 10 keep the facade going"; right?
- 11 MR. PURVIS: Object to form.
- 12 BY MR. MANNING:
- 13 Q. Isn't that right?
- 14 A. I don't know what they said. I have no way of
- 15 knowing. This document doesn't tell me that.
- 16 Q. What do you, as a historian, interpret the
- 17 words, "Our legal position in the U.S.A. will remain
- 18 in tact, as far as we have been advised"?
- 19 A. I do not analyze that as a historian because a
- 20 historian doesn't analyze one phrase in a document.
- 21 But, as an individual, what it tells me is that
- 22 they are of the belief that if they maintain their
- 23 equivocation position, their legal position will be
- 24 strengthened, or will remain intact. Whatever you
- 25 want to...

- 1 Q. And the disadvantages of that down there, under
- 2 the second item is that, "We will continue to be met
- 3 with incredulity whenever we make the statement";
- 4 right?
- 5 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 6 Q. That's a disadvantage that they were fully aware
- 7 of, right?
- 8 A. So it indicates here.
- 9 Q. Now, if you'd turn to page five.
- 10 A. (Complying.)
- 11 Q. In item "b" it says that, "We could move our
- 12 position on causation to one which acknowledges the
- 13 probability that smoking is harmful to a small
- 14 percentage of heavy smokers"; do you see that?
- 15 A. I do see that.
- 16 Q. "Advantages. Credibility will be restored to
- 17 the industry."
- 18 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Do you know whether they ever made that move in
- 20 their position?
- 21 A. I have no way of knowing that, sir.
- 22 Q. You didn't see that in the public documents --
- 23 A. No.
- 24 Q. -- you reviewed?
- 25 A. No, I did not.

- 1 Q. If they made that move that they're talking
- 2 about here in item number "b," to one which
- 3 acknowledges the probability that to a -- that
- 4 smoking is harmful to a small percentage of heavy
- 5 smokers, it wouldn't be true based on the documents
- 6 you've seen so far today, would it?
- 7 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 8 THE WITNESS: I couldn't say. I haven't seen --
- 9 BY MR. MANNING:
- 10 Q. You've seen documents --
- 11 A. I don't recall.
- 12 Q. -- that show unequivocally that they know that
- 13 smoking causes cancer --
- 14 A. Oh yes.
- 15 Q. -- to large numbers of people, whether they're
- 16 heavy smokers or not so heavy? You've seen those
- 17 documents?
- 18 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 19 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 20 And I've also seen the document indicating that
- 21 the heavier the smoker, the more the probability.
- 22 BY MR. MANNING:
- 23 Q. Correct.
- You've seen that, right?
- 25 A. I've seen that.

- 1 Q. Yeah. The greater numbers of people --
- 2 A. The greater number and the greater probability,
- 3 I assume, as well.
- 4 Q. Okay. But this position, one which acknowledges
- 5 the probability that smoking is harmful to a small
- 6 percentage of heavy smokers, if they move to that
- 7 position, that still wouldn't be accurate based on
- 8 what you saw in the documents?
- 9 A. Based on what those documents show, no.
- 10 Q. All right. So what we don't see, at least in
- 11 this document, so far, at least I haven't shown you
- 12 so far, anything that says, by gosh, you know what we
- 13 ought to do? We ought to stand up and tell the truth
- 14 and be honest human beings. We haven't seen that
- 15 yet, have we?
- 16 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 17 BY MR. MANNING:
- 18 Q. I haven't shown you that?
- 19 A. No, you haven't shown me that.
- 20 Q. I just want to represent to you that, if I see
- 21 it, I'll show it to you.
- 22 A. Sure.
- 23 Q. Good.
- 24 A. Although, may I also point out that it makes no
- 25 difference in my research topic.

- 1 Q. You said that from day one yesterday; correct?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. You're continuing to say that, --
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. -- right, today, after approximately two hours
- 6 of our review of documents together?
- 7 A. That is correct.
- 8 Q. Good.
- 9 Please turn, if you will, to the last page of
- 10 the document.
- 11 A. Last page?
- 12 Q. Please.
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And just read the conclusion, if you will, to
- 15 yourself. I won't read it into the record.
- 16 A. Surely.
- 17 (Reviewing document.)
- 18 Q. Have you read it, sir?
- 19 A. Yes, I have read it, sir.
- 20 Q. And what this shows clearly in this conclusion,
- 21 is that they knew they weren't telling the truth;
- 22 correct?
- 23 A. One can infer that from this, yes. But it
- 24 doesn't say that outright.
- 25 Q. No, it doesn't say it explicitly, but clearly

- 1 one can infer it?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 Q. And what it also says is that they're thinking
- 4 about changing and telling a little bit, but not tell
- 5 it all?
- 6 A. Again, it doesn't say that explicitly.
- 7 Q. But, again, it's a fair and accurate inference,
- 8 isn't it?
- 9 A. It's an assumption based on the reading of this,
- 10 yes, sir.
- 11 Q. It's a fair inference?
- 12 A. I'm sorry, inference.
- 13 Q. It's not an assumption?
- 14 A. No, no. Inference.
- 15 Q. And it's a fair inference from the reading?
- 16 A. I used the wrong word, sorry about that.
- 17 Q. But you agree with what I say, that it's a fair
- 18 inference from the reading?
- 19 A. Yes, sir.
- 20 Q. Okay. I just need a short break here.
- 21 (Recess taken.)
- 22 MR. PURVIS: Pursuant to our discussion
- 23 yesterday afternoon about notes and other materials
- 24 that may have been called for by the request, and our
- 25 decision that highlighted materials from

- 1 Professor Berman's files should be provided to you
- 2 pursuant to that request, last night Professor Berman
- 3 spent a great deal of time reviewing his files. And
- 4 I'm handing you those materials that had
- 5 highlightings. Even went so far as to include things
- 6 that had Post-Its with no writing on. This is the
- 7 material required to be produced.
- 8 MR. MANNING: Thank you.
- 9 Let me ask a few questions about this, if I may.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Professor Berman, make sure I understand.
- 12 You've obviously seen the documents that have been
- 13 handed to me?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Are you representing that you went through all
- 16 your six file drawers last night and looked at every
- 17 page --
- 18 A. No, sir.
- 19 Q. -- of every --
- 20 Let me finish my question, for the record.
- 21 So you did not go through every page of
- 22 documents to see whether or not highlighting or
- 23 underlining was on them?
- 24 A. Not on every page, no, sir.
- 25 Q. How did you do it?

- 1 A. I went through the file drawers where I knew
- 2 that there was highlighting and I got through that.
- 3 I skipped those file drawers that I knew were just
- 4 background stuff, in which there wasn't any
- 5 highlighting. And documents that were not centrally
- 6 used and, therefore, not highlighted, so far as I
- 7 could tell.
- 8 But basically, from my knowledge of what was
- 9 highlighted, we were able to go through just about
- 10 everything.
- 11 Q. How long did this take you?
- 12 A. Oh, approximately an hour and a half to maybe
- 13 two hours.
- 14 Q. Was somebody there with you?
- 15 A. Yes, sir.
- 16 Q. Who?
- 17 A. John Monica and Charles Lemley.
- 18 Q. Did they look through the files with you?
- 19 A. Yes, sir. They helped.
- 20 Q. Did they look through the files that you said
- 21 didn't have any highlighting?
- 22 A. No, sir, they did not.
- 23 Q. How many drawers did you look through?
- 24 A. Probably -- all of the drawers, but not
- 25 everything within all of the drawers.

- 1 Q. And this is all that you've brought to me out of
- 2 the six --
- 3 Approximately how deep are the six file
- 4 drawers? Two feet deep?
- 5 A. Normal file drawer, I would say.
- 6 Q. Okay.
- 7 MR. MANNING: Counsel, what I will do, I guess
- 8 with your permission, is take these and copy them and
- 9 return them to you.
- 10 MR. PURVIS: That would be fine. Again, we gave
- 11 you the originals because we weren't certain whether
- 12 the highlighting would show up on copies.
- MR. MANNING: I appreciate that.
- 14 Is there -- can I have the card of someone who
- 15 these should be mailed to, so I get them to the right
- 16 person? That --
- We can go off the record now.
- 18 (Discussion had off the record.)
- 19 BY MR. MANNING:
- 20 Q. Sir, showing you what's been mark he as
- 21 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 593.
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. This is a document called "Comments on 'Smoking
- 24 and Health', paper by Dr. F. G.... Someone. Right?
- 25 A. I can't make out the last name, no.

- 1 Q. 1983 it appears to be, right?
- 2 A. Appears to be 1983, yes, sir.
- 3 Q. It then says that the -- first paragraph here,
- 4 "The clearly expressed aim of the paper is to
- 5 establish that a controversy still exists about the
- 6 explanation for the statistical association between
- 7 smoking and various diseases, thereby supporting the
- 8 view prevailing in legal circles advising the tobacco
- 9 industry. That the aim is to support the legal
- 10 position is also indicated by the care taken to
- 11 stress that the evidence cannot be construed as
- 12 either indictment or as an exoneration for the
- 13 allegations that smoking is a possible health
- 14 hazard"; do you see that?
- 15 A. Yes, I do.
- 16 Q. If you will turn to page four, please.
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. "Overall Impressions."
- 19 A. Uh-huh.
- 20 Q. It says, "The conclusions that smoking can be
- 21 neither incriminated nor exonerated and that the
- 22 constitutional hypothesis is an equally valid
- 23 alternative to the causation hypothesis, will be
- 24 acceptable in legal circles. Scientists, outside the
- 25 industry, and unaware of the legal constraints, will

- 1 not be convinced that a controversy still exists."
- 2 Do you see that?
- 3 A. Yes, I do.
- 4 Q. Go on to the next page, page five. In the
- 5 middle of that page it says, "To persist in stressing
- 6 controversy where little or no evidence for such
- 7 controversy is seen to exist, can only result in a
- 8 complete loss of credibility"; right?
- 9 A. I do see that, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. That's evidently by D.G. Felton, August 2, 1983;
- 11 right?
- 12 A. That's what it says at the bottom of the page,
- 13 yes, sir.
- 14 Q. That is further confirmation that the
- 15 equivocation is both intentional and a lie; correct?
- 16 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 17 THE WITNESS: Equivocation is intentional, yes,
- 18 sir. A lie, I couldn't say.
- 19 BY MR. MANNING:
- 20 Q. It's further evidence, is it not, by the
- 21 portions that I read to you, that this reflects
- 22 knowledge, at least by this author, that scientists
- 23 outside the industry will not even be convinced that
- 24 a controversy still exists? They're aware of that,
- 25 aren't they?

- 1 A. That is correct.
- 2 Q. And as you saw today, they are aware of that at
- 3 least as early as 1958; correct?
- 4 A. According to the document you read me, yes, sir.
- 5 Q. And this position of equivocation appears to
- 6 continue even in 1983; correct?
- 7 A. That's so indicated here, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. And that position is not credible, is it?
- 9 A. No, sir, it's not.
- 10 Q. And it's acknowledged by them in the last page
- 11 here that if it continues there will be a complete
- 12 loss of credibility; correct?
- 13 A. That's what it indicates there, yes, sir.
- 14 Q. And so they know it's not credible, right?
- 15 A. So it indicates, yes.
- 16 Q. And so they know it's a lie; correct?
- 17 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 18 THE WITNESS: I couldn't say what they knew,
- 19 whether it's a lie or not. I can go on the evidence
- 20 that you've given me, not any more, as far as I've
- 21 gone.
- 22 BY MR. MANNING:
- 23 Q. Correct.
- 24 Based on the evidence that I've given you, not
- 25 having gone any further, you can say it's a lie?

- 1 A. No. I said I can't go that far.
- 2 Q. Oh. You can only go so far as to say it, in
- 3 fact, is not credible?
- 4 A. That is correct.
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 A. Now remember, I'm responding here as an
- 7 individual, not as an expert. I'm responding here as
- 8 a citizen, and not as a historian.
- 9 Q. In fact, what historians do, as we've
- 10 acknowledged, and as you've acknowledged to me, is
- 11 they review documents just like this?
- 12 A. Within context.
- 13 Q. Correct. They review volumes of them within the
- 14 context?
- 15 A. Correct.
- 16 Q. And you don't just review one, you look at a lot
- 17 of them to see if one confirms the other?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. You don't just look at one company, because
- 20 there might just be one wild-eyed scientist in one
- 21 company that was hair-brained and off in a corner by
- 22 himself and then it would be a historical mistake to
- 23 make a conclusion based on that joker; right?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. But, in fact, if all the scientists in the

- 1 companies were saying the same thing, and if a lot of
- 2 the executives were hearing those scientists and they
- 3 were saying the same things, then from a historical
- 4 perspective that would be confirmation of accuracy,
- 5 would it not?
- 6 A. Not really because a historian has to work fully
- 7 in that field. I am not. I have not worked fully in
- 8 that field and I cannot make that kind of statement.
- 9 Q. All right.
- 10 A. I can only respond to the excerpts of documents
- 11 that you are giving me, but reading me, on the basis,
- 12 not of a historical analysis, but as a personal
- 13 analysis.
- 14 Q. I understand.
- 15 A. And I'll be happy to do so.
- 16 Q. And at some point in time, when you do a
- 17 personal analysis, it's possible that it would be
- 18 converted into a historical analysis, if you so
- 19 decided to undertake it?
- 20 A. If I so decided to undertake one, it could, yes.
- 21 Q. Sure. Because, as we've already acknowledged,
- 22 and I'm just repeating, in fact you could do this
- 23 historical analysis, if you wanted to, if you
- 24 undertook it?
- 25 A. Most credible historians could, yes, sir.

- 1 Q. Including you?
- 2 A. Yes, sir.
- 3 (Exhibit 3142 marked for identification.)
- 4 BY MR. MANNING:
- 5 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as Document
- 6 Number 3142, this is a letter by William Kloepfer,
- 7 Junior, of the Tobacco Institute, to Mr. Tom Humber,
- 8 the Assistant Director of Corporate Affairs at Brown
- 9 and Williamson; right?
- 10 A. That's what the letter indicates, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. It says to Mr. Tom Humber, "Dear Tom: The good
- 12 news this morning is you are to be reappointed as
- 13 Chairman of the Communications Committee, " for the
- 14 Tobacco Institute; do you see that?
- 15 A. It doesn't say Tobacco Institute, but I assume
- 16 that's what it's referring to.
- 17 Q. Right.
- 18 It says, "As we look forward, one of our tasks
- 19 is to blunt in every possible way the march of the
- 20 anti-smokers in Minnesota, where a special movement
- 21 is underway, using legislation and propaganda to put
- 22 the state in the forefront of the drive for a
- 23 smoke-free society"; do you see that?
- 24 A. I do certainly see that.
- 25 Q. Okay. And so now you have seen at least a

- 1 document that reflected in 1965 lobbying activity on
- 2 behalf of the industry; right?
- 3 A. Uh-huh.
- 4 Q. Now you see one in 1984, it's not yet talking
- 5 about nothing less than complete victory will be
- 6 acceptable? What it's saying now is they're going to
- 7 blunt this movement in every possible way they can;
- 8 right?
- 9 A. That's what this letter says, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. It also says, "One of the benefits of the
- 11 tobacco economy in Minnesota is support of local
- 12 media through cigarette brand advertising"; right?
- 13 A. That's what it says.
- 14 Q. "I would like to have an opportunity to discuss
- 15 these public interest implications at the January
- 16 16th meeting of the Committee"; right?
- 17 A. That's what it says.
- 18 Q. Now you didn't interview anybody in the press of
- 19 all these articles that you read, to see if at all
- 20 there was any impact on the press by tobacco
- 21 companies advertising in those press?
- 22 A. No, I did not.
- 23 Q. You didn't look at that with respect to
- 24 Fortune Magazine, did you?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- 1 Q. You didn't look at that with respect to
- 2 U.S. News & World Report?
- 3 A. No, I did not.
- 4 Q. You didn't look at that with respect to CBS?
- 5 A. No, I did not.
- 6 Q. You didn't look at that with respect to
- 7 Minneapolis Star Tribune?
- 8 A. I believe from the Minneapolis Star Tribune we
- 9 do have cited here -- somewhere in here -- the
- 10 marketing things of cigarette marketing that perhaps
- 11 reflect this kind of interconnection. Perhaps. But
- 12 let me find it for you and note it for you, please.
- 13 Q. No problem.
- I'll just take at your word that there's
- 15 something here that perhaps reflects that.
- 16 A. Yes. Yes. Okay. Fine. Let's continue, then.
- 17 Q. What you didn't do is you didn't go interview
- 18 the owners of the Star Tribune, or the editors, at
- 19 the times in question, when these articles were
- 20 being --
- 21 A. No, I didn't.
- 22 Q. -- published, and scratch the surface to see
- 23 whether or not there was any impact by cigarette
- 24 advertising?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- 1 Q. But you're at least aware that by this document
- 2 there was support of the local media through
- 3 cigarette brand advertising?
- 4 A. That's what the writer of the document
- 5 indicates, yes, sir.
- 6 Q. All right. Now, sir, showing you what's been
- 7 marked as Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 322.
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. It's a document called, "Smoking and Health:
- 10 The Background and Climate"; right?
- 11 A. That's what it says on the top, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. It's again, a BAT document, right?
- 13 A. Pardon me?
- 14 Q. It's a BAT document, right?
- 15 A. Says so on the bottom, yes, sir.
- 16 Q. I'm going to turn to the second page. "Two
- 17 defenses are still available to the industry"; do you
- 18 see that right in the middle?
- 19 A. I'm sorry.
- 20 Oh, yes, I do see.
- 21 Q. "Two defenses are still available to the
- 22 industry: a) lack of proof of causation"; do you see
- 23 that?
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Now, if you look on the third page, this is a

- 1 February 28th document, 1985?
- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q. And you have now seen many documents that, in
- 4 fact, reflect, as we have discussed, that the
- 5 cigarette companies knew far in advance of 1985 that
- 6 cigarette smoking caused cancer?
- 7 A. Oh certainly, yes.
- 8 Q. In fact, they knew it beyond a reasonable doubt,
- 9 as they said; correct?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. And "b" here, the defenses are --
- 12 A. I'm sorry. We're back on page --
- 13 Q. Back on page two.
- 14 A. Go ahead.
- 15 Q. In "b" we have "Voluntary assumption of risks,
- 16 which involve the plaintiff having been made aware of
- 17 the potential risks involved in smoking"; that's
- 18 another defense, right?
- 19 A. That's the indication here, yes.
- 20 Q. "US trial lawyers have suggested that, from a
- 21 practical point of view, juries may be more skeptical
- 22 when considering the causation defense"; it appears
- 23 to be what is being suggested here?
- 24 A. That's right.
- 25 Q. Right?

- 1 A. That's right.
- 2 Q. And that skepticism they're talking about in the
- 3 public jury is the same skepticism you have?
- 4 A. Yes, sir.
- 5 Q. It then says, "We must continue to exercise care
- 6 to insure that nothing is said or done inadvertently
- 7 anywhere in the world which could jeopardize either
- 8 of these defenses"; do you see that?
- 9 A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. It's a powerful statement, isn't it?
- 11 A. Pardon me?
- 12 Q. It's a powerful statement?
- 13 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 14 BY MR. MANNING:
- 15 Q. Do you agree?
- 16 A. It's a statement. I don't know how -- I don't
- 17 know the writer -- how powerful his rhetoric is, or
- 18 how weak his rhetoric is. Whether this is a weak or
- 19 powerful statement, I have no way of knowing that,
- 20 sir.
- 21 Q. "Conclusion" -- do you see that?
- 22 A. Conclusion?
- 23 Q. Same page.
- 24 A. Oh, same page? Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Second sentence, "However, while the majority of

- 1 medical opinion judge the relationship between
- 2 smoking and various diseases to be causal, we believe
- 3 there's an opportunity to suggest to opinion makers
- 4 that open-mindedness should be reserved on the issues
- 5 and that some recent scientific developments
- 6 questioned to varying extents the judgment that
- 7 smoking is the major cause of a number of diseases";
- 8 do you see that?
- 9 A. I do see that, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. They believe there's an opportunity to suggest
- 11 to opinion makers; right?
- 12 A. That's what it says.
- 13 Q. And one group of opinion makers are the press?
- 14 A. I assume so, yes.
- 15 Q. Absolutely.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And they, as you have acknowledged on items --
- 18 pages one through thirty-seven, are the great bulk of
- 19 how public opinion was being influenced?
- 20 A. That's correct.
- 21 Q. Was through the press?
- 22 A. That's correct.
- 23 Q. And this document confirms that they, at least
- 24 this company, believes that it can impact those
- 25 public opinion makers, the press?

- 1 A. So it says, yes.
- 2 Q. And you, in your review of press articles, saw
- 3 evidence of that, where there was equivocation?
- 4 A. No. What I saw was industry equivocation, not
- 5 reporters' equivocation, sir.
- 6 Q. I understand. Industry equivocation through the
- 7 press?
- 8 A. Of course. Sure. They were reporting what the
- 9 industry was saying.
- 10 Q. Absolutely. Being quoted and various other
- 11 things?
- 12 A. That's right.
- 13 Q. Yeah.
- 14 And so you saw, in your historical analysis,
- 15 precisely industry statements in the press that
- 16 confirm what this memo was suggesting that they could
- 17 do?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Namely, influence public opinion?
- 20 A. Well, through their statements, which are -- a
- 21 reporter conscientiously takes down and reports in
- 22 the news story, certainly, yes.
- 23 Q. Right.
- 24 A. I hope you're not making the assumption that the
- 25 reporter isn't biased?

- 1 Q. No, sir.
- 2 I don't mean to throw those at you. If it
- 3 offends you, tell me.
- 4 A. No, no.
- 5 Q. I'm just getting lackadaisical.
- 6 A. No, no. That's quite all right.
- 7 Q. Now here we have a document, Plaintiffs' Exhibit
- 8 438, right?
- 9 A. That's -- yes.
- 10 Q. It's an RJR interoffice memo; right?
- 11 A. It's an interoffice memo. I'm not sure where it
- 12 comes from.
- 13 Q. Subject --
- 14 A. Yes, now I see on the other side it is.
- 15 Q. The subject is, "Comments on 1987 Strategic
- 16 Plan"; right?
- 17 A. That's what the subject states, yes.
- 18 Q. And the date is June 30 -- 13 '86?
- 19 A. June 13th.
- 20 Q. 1986?
- 21 A. 1986, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. From a Dr. Robert L. Suber to a Dr. A.W. Hayes;
- 23 right?
- 24 A. That's correct.
- 25 Q. Two docs talking to each other, right?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. On the second page, if you will, beginning of
- 3 that paragraph, it says, "As a long-term solution to
- 4 the public's view of tobacco, I think the companies
- 5 should reverse their position that problems don't
- 6 exist with tobaccos. We should explain to the public
- 7 that thresholds for biological effects do exist, the
- 8 concept of biochemical individuality and that we are
- 9 attempting to make new products which address their
- 10 concerns"; do you see that?
- 11 A. I do.
- 12 Q. Now in your historical review, prior to looking
- 13 at anything like our complaint, or the Kluger book,
- 14 or the Internet, you saw nothing to this effect?
- 15 A. Sorry. To the effect of what?
- 16 Q. That sentence, "I think the company should
- 17 reverse their position that problems don't exist with
- 18 tobaccos. We should explain to the public that
- 19 thresholds for biological effects..." The remainder
- 20 of that sentence. You saw nothing like this when you
- 21 did your historical analysis?
- 22 A. I don't recall seeing anything like that. Yes,
- 23 sir.
- 24 Q. Correct.
- 25 (Exhibit 3143 marked for identification.)

- 1 BY MR. MANNING:
- 2 Q. Now, sir, this is a document from Mike Curry to
- 3 Kent Wold; right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. The subject is the Minnesota Action Plan, right?
- 6 A. That is correct.
- 7 Q. June 10, 1988?
- 8 A. Uh-huh.
- 9 Q. This is an RJR document, right?
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Interoffice correspondence, correct?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. It says, "This recommends a commitment of RJRT
- 14 people resources in Minnesota for creating a personal
- 15 involvement to neutralize the nation's most..." --
- 16 there's a word blocked out, isn't it?
- 17 A. Yeah.
- 18 Q. Can you read it?
- 19 A. I can't read the word that's blocked out, but
- 20 the next two words are clear.
- 21 Q. "...the nation's most anti-tobacco legislative
- 22 environment"?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. That's what you acknowledged yesterday?
- 25 A. Oh certainly.

- 1 Q. Minnesota was either -- was close to the top?
- 2 A. A leader. No question about that.
- 3 Q. If you go down under the "Problem" there. It
- 4 says, "Notably," the last sentence under "Problem,"
- 5 "Minnesota is a bellweather-catalyst for other
- 6 states seeking innovative ways to restrict tobacco";
- 7 do you see that?
- 8 A. Yes, I do.
- 9 Q. So this was the tobacco companies themselves
- 10 acknowledging that Minnesota was doing things in an
- 11 innovative way to restrict tobacco; right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. At the forefront?
- 14 A. At the forefront.
- 15 Q. It doesn't say that they were lax in enforcement
- 16 or anything of that sort, does it?
- 17 A. I don't -- from the sections that you read me,
- 18 no.
- 19 Q. All right. It says, "Therefore, Minnesota's
- 20 environment affects our situation in other states";
- 21 right?
- 22 A. Yes, sir. That's what it says.
- 23 Q. "Objectives." Last sentence, "Long term, a
- 24 committed involvement program," the last sentence of
- 25 "Objectives."

- 1 A. Yes, I do see.
- 2 Q. "Long term, a committed involvement program may
- 3 achieve reversal of Minnesota's antagonism towards
- 4 tobacco"; right?
- 5 A. That's what it says.
- 6 Q. "Program Elements. RJR should develop a
- 7 corporate team comprised of our lobbyists, public
- 8 issues/PR group, Field Sales and Marketing Research,
- 9 to fully comprehend, then overcome the unique
- 10 Minnesota tobacco antagonism. We should combine the
- 11 capabilities of our marketing research with the
- 12 insights of RJRT's two highly respected,
- 13 knowledgeable lobbyists."
- 14 It goes on to say that they want to develop
- 15 persuasive open-minded messages for target
- 16 recipients, right?
- 17 A. Uh-huh.
- 18 Q. Under additional opportunities it says, "As
- 19 progress is made in personal contacts RJR should
- 20 become involved in contributing to Minnesota's
- 21 economy, especially to reach the DFL, the Democratic
- 22 Farm Labor leadership. Three major issues include:
- 23 The high importance of organized labor; massive
- 24 Iron Range unemployment, and the farm economy in
- 25 Southern and Western Minnesota."

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Do you see that?
- 2 A. I do.
- 3 Q. This reflects a commitment, does it not, an
- 4 interest, at least by Mike Curry to Kent Wold, to
- 5 target Minnesota?
- 6 A. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. It reflects some understanding of Minnesota,
- 8 doesn't it, by way of both city, farm, and
- 9 Iron Range?
- 10 A. It seems that way, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. It further reflects the support by way of the
- 12 companies for the lobbying efforts in Minnesota?
- 13 A. So it indicates in this document, yes, sir.
- 14 Q. None of which you've analyzed or looked at in
- 15 the course of your --
- 16 A. That is correct.
- 17 Q. -- historical analysis?
- 18 A. That is correct.
- 19 Q. None of which you asked for from the tobacco
- 20 companies in the course of your historical analysis?
- 21 A. That's right.
- 22 (Exhibit 3144 marked for identification.)
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. Then there's a letter by Tom A. Briant, on the
- 25 third page, an Attorney at Law, to various people?

- 1 A. Which page? Third page?
- 2 Q. Third page?
- 3 A. Yes, I have it.
- 4 Q. And it's on the stationery of Minnesota
- 5 Wholesale Marketers Association, do you see that?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. The re on the letter is the "1996 Funding
- 8 Request for the Minnesota Wholesale Marketers
- 9 Association"; right?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. It's written to the Tobacco Institute and a
- 12 number of tobacco companies; right?
- 13 A. That's correct.
- 14 Q. Do you see where he's writing to request that
- 15 they consider funding the Wholesale Marketers
- 16 Association?
- 17 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 18 Q. Do you see that?
- 19 A. Yeah.
- 20 Q. In the first paragraph?
- 21 A. The first sentence, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. Okay. Now, at the bottom there it says, "During
- 23 1995 the association has been directly involved in
- 24 numerous tobacco-related efforts and issues. The
- 25 association's efforts have included the following."

- 1 Let's go over on to item three.
- 2 A. Two?
- 3 Q. Item three, please.
- 4 A. Three?
- 5 Q. Saying the association "Lobbied against
- 6 twenty-one proposed cigarette excise tax increases
- 7 through member contact with state legislators,
- 8 professional lobbyists meeting with state legislators
- 9 and corresponding with House and Senate leadership on
- 10 the negative impact of a cigarette tax increase. All
- 11 twenty-one attempts to raise cigarette excise taxes
- 12 were defeated"; right?
- 13 A. I see that indicated there, yes.
- 14 Q. You did not ask the tobacco industry, or any of
- 15 these companies, or the institute, for documents
- 16 about -- that would reflect who they were associated
- 17 with in their lobbying efforts, did you?
- 18 A. No, I did not.
- 19 Q. You are aware that many times in lobbying
- 20 efforts industries enhance their strength by working
- 21 with other industries in attempting to --
- 22 A. I am familiar with that, yes.
- 23 Q. And, in fact, this document would reflect that
- 24 such a relationship successfully as described by this
- 25 gentleman, existed with the Minnesota Wholesale

- 1 Marketers Association?
- 2 A. So the document indicates.
- 3 Q. And they were so successful that twenty-one
- 4 attempts to raise cigarette excise taxes, they
- 5 defeated, didn't they?
- 6 A. So it says on item three.
- 7 Q. Under item five they made political fund
- 8 contributions to key legislators, right?
- 9 A. That's what it says.
- 10 Q. In item ten they even co-sponsored the Annual
- 11 Holiday Treats Program at the Governor's mansion for
- 12 kids; right?
- 13 A. That's what it says.
- 14 Q. Other than the Minnesota Wholesalers
- 15 Association, you don't know who else the tobacco
- 16 industry and its lobbyists were working with, in
- 17 conjunction, do you?
- 18 A. No, I do not.
- 19 Q. You don't know the size and the strength of the
- 20 lobbying force that was in existence here in the
- 21 state of Minnesota on behalf of the tobacco industry,
- 22 do you?
- 23 A. No, I do not.
- 24 Q. And you don't know its effects?
- 25 A. I'm sorry.

- 1 Q. And you do not really know its effects on the
- 2 legislation that you have reviewed in the course of
- 3 your historical analysis, do you?
- 4 A. No, not direct.
- 5 Q. Okay.
- 6 MR. MANNING: Why don't we take our lunch break.
- 7 (Luncheon recess taken.)
- 8 (Exhibit 3145 marked for identification.)
- 9 BY MR. MANNING:
- 10 Q. Sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 11 Deposition Exhibit 3145, you see that that is a
- 12 document, Draft Number 1, January, 1964; right?
- 13 A. That's what it says up there, yes.
- 14 Q. The proposal is for "Research On Trends In
- 15 Cigarette Smoking Among Teenagers"; correct?
- 16 A. That is what the title indicates, yes.
- 17 Q. It's on the paper of the William Esty Company?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Do you know who they are?
- 20 A. No, I have no idea.
- 21 Q. Says, "Purpose: To provide information on trends
- 22 among high school juniors and seniors, among college
- 23 freshmen and sophomores in: a) the incidence of
- 24 cigarette smoking"; right?
- 25 A. That's what it says, yes.

- 1 Q. "Daily cigarette consumption"; right?
- 2 A. That's what it says.
- 3 Q. "Cigarette type and brand preference"; right?
- 4 A. That's what it says.
- 5 Q. And "Brand switching"; right?
- 6 A. That's what it says.
- 7 Q. It's pretty clear that there's some interest
- 8 here, by the statement in the document, in
- 9 high school juniors and seniors; right?
- 10 A. That's what this statement says, yes.
- 11 (Exhibit 3146 marked for identification.)
- 12 BY MR. MANNING:
- 13 Q. Next we have a document that is -- says Tobacco
- 14 Institute, gives the address in Washington; right?
- 15 A. Uh-huh. Yes.
- 16 Q. The contact is William Kloepfer, Junior; do you
- 17 see that?
- 18 A. Yes, I do.
- 19 Q. We've seen his name before, haven't we?
- 20 A. I believe so.
- 21 Q. And it says, "For use on and after Sunday,
- 22 January 3, 1971"; right?
- 23 A. That's what it says there, yes.
- 24 Q. In the beginning of the document it says,
- 25 "A cigarette industry spokesman looked ahead today

- 1 to 1971 as a year of sharply reduced noise level in
- 2 the smoking and health controversy and said this
- 3 could provide for a speedup of its scientific
- 4 resolution"; do you see that?
- 5 A. I do see that.
- 6 Q. Now let's turn to the very end of the document,
- 7 if you will.
- 8 A. (Complying.)
- 9 It is a five-page document?
- 10 Q. Yes. Fifth page, last sentence.
- 11 A. Yes, I've got it.
- 12 Q. Says Kornegay -- does this appear to be
- 13 something for use on or after Sunday, January 3,
- 14 1971? Does it appear to you to be something for use
- 15 in the public?
- 16 A. I have no idea what it's for.
- 17 Q. It appears from the Tobacco Institute, or
- 18 something put out by the Tobacco Institute; right?
- 19 A. Well, the Tobacco Institute, I understand, was
- 20 in fact the public relations arm of the tobacco
- 21 industry.
- 22 Q. Right.
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. It appears that they're the title on the
- 25 document; right?
 - STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
 P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. That's correct.
- 2 Q. They, as public relations arm, say for use on or
- 3 after January 3, 1971?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. Last, again paragraph, on page five. It says,
- 6 "Kornegay declared that, quote, 'Every statistical
- 7 path linking smoking to some form of ill health leads
- 8 directly to a locked door. In 1971 we have a great
- 9 opportunity for new efforts to find the keys. Any
- 10 organization in a position to apply resources in the
- 11 search of those keys, and which fails to do so, will
- 12 continue to be guilty of cruel neglect of those whom
- 13 it pretends to serve'"; do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes, I do.
- 15 Q. Now, when Kornegay declared there that, quote,
- 16 "Every statistical path linking smoking to some form
- 17 of ill health leads directly to a locked door," as
- 18 we've discussed so many times, you and I both know,
- 19 but you know in particular, that's not true; right?
- 20 A. I don't know what they mean by a locked door.
- 21 Q. Well, every statistical path linking smoking --
- 22 A. Uh-huh.
- 23 Q. -- to some form of ill health leads directly to
- 24 a locked door, meaning no, there's not ill health?
- 25 A. I'm sorry.

- 1 Q. How do you read that?
- 2 A. I have no idea what they mean. Out of the
- 3 context of the five-page document, to get one
- 4 sentence, I don't know what they're talking about. I
- 5 really don't. I'm sorry.
- 6 Q. No problem.
- 7 A. I have no idea what they're talking about.
- 8 Maybe if I read the whole document I would. But I
- 9 don't, on the basis of what you gave me and what I
- 10 see here.
- 11 Q. Let's do it again for the jury's benefit and for
- 12 your benefit.
- 13 A. Surely.
- 14 Q. Okay. Because I want to make sure that you want
- 15 to stand by your position that you don't understand
- 16 this sentence at all.
- 17 The sentence says, "Kornegay declared that
- 18 'every statistical path linking smoke to some form
- 19 of ill health leads directly to a locked door.'".
- 20 Do you not, sir, interpret that sentence to mean
- 21 that -- what it says, a statistical path, such as an
- 22 epidemiological path?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Or other statistical path, linking smoking to
- 25 ill health, leads to a locked door; in other words,

- 1 there is no link?
- 2 A. There is no link?
- 3 Q. Is that how you read it?
- 4 A. I can't read that at all. "Every statistical
- 5 path leading smoking to some form of ill health leads
- 6 directly to a locked door." I don't see any denial
- 7 of that in that phrase. I don't know what a locked
- 8 door means in the context of this phrase. I'm
- 9 sorry. I wish I could help you on it.
- 10 Q. Okay. It's no problem at all.
- 11 A. Uh-huh.
- 12 Q. Stand by your testimony.
- But the last sentence, "Any organization in a
- 14 position to apply resources in the search for those
- 15 keys," keys to the locked door.
- 16 A. That's correct.
- 17 Q. "...and which fails to do so, will continue to
- 18 be guilty of cruel neglect of those whom it pretends
- 19 to serve"; correct?
- 20 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 21 Q. So if in fact the tobacco companies had keys to
- 22 this supposed locked door, --
- 23 A. Uh-huh.
- 24 Q. -- if they had science?
- 25 A. If they had?

- 1 Q. Science?
- 2 A. Science, yes.
- 3 Q. That they were aware of, that they didn't
- 4 provide to the surgeon general, for example, or to
- 5 the public; okay?
- 6 A. (Nodding.)
- 7 Q. And if they have other information and other
- 8 opportunities that they didn't provide to the surgeon
- 9 general and didn't provide to the public, assume that
- 10 to be accurate. Then, in the words of the Tobacco
- 11 Institute, those companies who didn't do that, would
- 12 be guilty of cruel neglect, wouldn't they?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 14 BY MR. MANNING:
- 15 Q. Wouldn't they?
- 16 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Thank you.
- Now showing you, sir, what's been marked as
- 19 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1118. Have you ever seen that
- 20 document before?
- 21 A. No.
- 22 Q. It's marked, "CONFIDENTIAL RJR"; right?
- 23 A. That's what it says on the top, yes, sir.
- 24 Q. September 21, '72, right?
- 25 A. That's the date on top, yes, sir.

- 1 Q. It says, "Company Share of Smokers By Age"; do
- 2 you see that?
- 3 A. "Company Shares Broken By Age Groups" is what I
- 4 see.
- 5 Q. Right above the age groups it says, "Company
- 6 Share of Smokers by Age."
- 7 A. Oh, I see. The table you're referring to.
- 8 Q. Right. I'm sorry.
- 9 A. Yes, sir, I do see that.
- 10 Q. I'm sorry. My fault.
- 11 And, in fact, one of the groups that is there is
- 12 fourteen- to seventeen-year-olds; right?
- 13 A. Yes.
- 14 Q. And underneath that table is a paragraph that
- 15 says, "Of course, Marlboro is the primary reason that
- 16 Philip Morris does so well among young adults. In
- 17 the last six years Marlboro King has almost doubled
- 18 its share with almost all of its growth coming from
- 19 young adults"; do you see that?
- 20 A. Yes, I do.
- 21 Q. Turn over to the next page, please.
- 22 A. (Complying.)
- 23 Q. We now have another table of share of smokers by
- 24 age, from '66 to '72; right?
- 25 A. Share of smokers -- '66 to '72. Yes, I see

- 1 that.
- 2 Q. And, again, here we have the table broken out
- 3 between fourteen- to twenty-year-olds; right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And the document is by a J.H. Sherrill, Junior,
- 6 from the Marketing Research Department of RJR; right?
- 7 A. Yes.
- 8 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 9 BY MR. MANNING:
- 10 Q. Does it appear that way to you?
- 11 A. It's -- his initials are above a typed J.H.
- 12 Sherrill, Junior, Marketing Research Department, yes,
- 13 sir.
- 14 Q. So it would at least appear to you, as a
- 15 historian, that the Marketing Research Department in
- 16 1972 was breaking out fourteen- to
- 17 seventeen-year-olds in its analysis of marketing
- 18 research?
- 19 A. According to this document, yes.
- 20 According to the parts of this document that
- 21 I've seen, yes.
- 22 (Exhibit 3147 marked for identification.)
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. Here we have a April 19, '73 document; right,
- 25 sir?

- 1 A. The -- date is on the top, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. The re on it is "Camel Filter And Young Adult
- 3 Smoker"; right?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And it appears, again, to be written by -- on
- 6 the second page, someone from the Marketing Research
- 7 Department, named P.E. Galyan?
- 8 A. P.E. Galyan, yes, sir.
- 9 Q. And it appears --
- 10 A. Although there's no signature. Just the typed
- 11 indication.
- 12 Q. All right.
- 13 In the first paragraph it says -- and it appears
- 14 to be a Mr. C.C. Standen; right?
- 15 A. That is correct.
- 16 Q. "You have expressed interest in examining the
- 17 youth market and the role Camel Filter plays in that
- 18 market. The attached information should help you in
- 19 this regard.
- "The Youth Market. Judgmentally, a brand's
- 21 ability to gain acceptance among younger smokers is
- 22 an indication of its potential for future success";
- 23 right?
- 24 A. That's what it says.
- 25 Q. "The size of the market is also large"; right?

- 1 A. That's what it says.
- 2 Q. Going down under "The 85 Millimeter Normal
- 3 Flavor Filter Category, " the last sentence says,
- 4 "Finally, note that among very young smokers in the
- 5 fourteen- to twenty-year age, 54% choose
- 6 85 millimeter NFF brands"; do you see that?
- 7 A. Yes, I do.
- 8 Q. Do you know what NNF brands means?
- 9 A. No, I do not.
- 10 Q. Again, it would be -- appear to be a second
- 11 document, close in time to the one I just showed you,
- 12 one year later in '73, on behalf of RJR in which
- 13 communication is going on, in their words, about the
- 14 very young smokers in the fourteen- to twenty-age
- 15 range; correct?
- 16 A. That's what the document seems to indicate, yes,
- 17 sir.
- Or, again, that portion of the document which we
- 19 read.
- 20 May I make a blanket statement at this time?
- 21 Whenever I say that, I mean the portion of the
- 22 document which we have read.
- 23 Q. Showing you, sir, what's been marked as
- 24 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1035; do you see that document?
- 25 A. I do.

- 1 Q. If you turn to the -- it's a little hard on the
- 2 first page, but it says in handwriting, "Marketing
- 3 Plans"; right?
- 4 A. On the bottom -- on the middle of the first page
- 5 it says so, yes, in handwriting.
- 6 Q. Then on the second page it says, "1975 Marketing
- 7 Plans Presentation, Hilton Head, September 30, '74?
- 8 A. That's what it says.
- 9 Q. Do you know where Hilton Head is?
- 10 A. It's on the coast of the Atlantic Coast. It's a
- 11 resort hotel, I believe. If I'm not mistaken.
- 12 Q. A little island right off of Charleston,
- 13 South Carolina?
- 14 A. That's right. Off Charleston.
- 15 Q. And on chart number one, the objective in 1975,
- 16 it says, "Our paramount marketing objective in 1975
- 17 and ensuing years is to re-establish RJR's share of
- 18 marketing growth in the domestic cigarette industry";
- 19 do you see that?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 Q. Pretty clear statement about their intention and
- 22 objective, isn't it?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Chart number two, item number one.
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. Under four key opportunities, one of them is --
- 2 the first one, to increase our young adult franchise;
- 3 right?
- 4 A. I see it.
- 5 Q. At the bottom of that, number two, it says,
- 6 "First let's look at the growing importance of the
- 7 young adult in the cigarette market. In 1960 this
- 8 young adult market, fourteen to twenty-four age
- 9 group, represented 21% of the population"; do you see
- 10 that?
- 11 A. I do.
- 12 Q. So you're now seeing, once again, the young
- 13 adult market being referred to as fourteen-,
- 14 fifteen-, sixteen-, and seventeen- and
- 15 eighteen-year-olds?
- 16 A. According to this document, yes.
- 17 Q. And you've seen that now in numerous documents?
- 18 A. In at least two.
- 19 Q. Under chart number three, "As seen by this
- 20 chart, they will represent 27% of the population in
- 21 1975. They represent tomorrow's cigarette business.
- 22 As this fourteen to twenty-four age group matures
- 23 they will account for a key share of the total
- 24 cigarette volume for at least the next twenty-five
- 25 years; right?

- 1 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Please turn to the second page.
- 3 A. Next page?
- 4 Q. Please.
- 5 A. (Complying.)
- 6 Q. What do you see in that -- I'm not going to read
- 7 it all under chart number four. It talks about
- 8 Philip Morris having 38% share of the fourteen to
- 9 twenty-four year old age category and B&W a 21%
- 10 share; right?
- 11 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. See how it says, "With strong adult franchises
- 13 and high cigarette brand loyalties, this suggests
- 14 continued growth for Philip Morris and B&W as their
- 15 smokers mature"; right?
- 16 A. So it says on this document.
- 17 Q. Says, "In sharp contrast, our company line shows
- 18 a pattern of relatively even strength among all age
- 19 groups and strength in the twenty-five and older
- 20 categories, where we exceed both competitors"; do you
- 21 see that?
- 22 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 23 Q. If you skip to the last sentence it says, this
- 24 suggests slow market share erosion for us in the
- 25 years to come unless the situation is corrected;

- 1 right?
- 2 A. I see it, yes.
- 3 Q. Next page.
- 4 A. (Complying.)
- 5 Q. "Thus, our strategy becomes clearer for our
- 6 established brands. Direct advertising appeal to the
- 7 younger smokers"; right?
- 8 A. I see it.
- 9 Q. Showing you, sir, what's been marked as
- 10 Plaintiffs' Exhibit -- Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1037.
- 11 That's a one-page document, right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Correct, sir? One-page document?
- 14 A. Yes, it is a one-page document.
- 15 Q. Marked "RJR's Secret"; right?
- 16 A. Yes, sir. "RJR Secret" on top, right-hand
- 17 corner.
- 18 Q. Again, it's from a J.F. Hind to Mr. C.A. Tucker;
- 19 right?
- 20 A. J.F. Hind, signed Jim, yes, sir. To Mr. C.A.
- 21 Tucker, yes.
- 22 Q. About midway through the first paragraph it
- 23 says, "To ensure increased and long-term growth for
- 24 Camel Filter, the brand must increase its share
- 25 penetration among the fourteen to twenty-four age

- 1 group, which have a new set of more liberal values
- 2 and which represent tomorrow's cigarette business";
- 3 do you see that?
- 4 A. I do see it.
- 5 Q. You've now seen a number of documents here by
- 6 RJR that reflect a clear intent to target, penetrate,
- 7 advertise to, appeal to, fourteen-, fifteen-,
- 8 sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds; correct?
- 9 A. I have seen such documents.
- 10 Q. You've never seen those before?
- 11 A. Pardon?
- 12 Q. You've never seen those before?
- 13 A. I've never seen those before, no, sir.
- 14 Q. You've seen those allegations made in the
- 15 amended complaint?
- 16 A. I've seen those made in the amended complaint.
- 17 Q. You've seen them discussed in Mr. Kluger's book
- 18 "From Ashes to Ashes"?
- 19 A. Yes, I have.
- 20 Q. You've read about such allegations in documents
- 21 that are contained in the book "The Smoking Papers"?
- 22 A. No, I have not read the book "The Smoking
- 23 Papers."
- 24 Q. No. I said you've read about those allegations
- 25 existing in documents when you have read about "The

- 1 Smoking Papers" book in press and on the Internet?
- 2 A. Probably in the press, yes, sir.
- 3 Q. And now for the first time you have seen some of
- 4 those actual documents; correct?
- 5 A. Some, yes.
- 6 Q. And so it is at least easy for you now at this
- 7 stage to say, based on this very short time we've had
- 8 together reviewing documents, that you've at least
- 9 reviewed more than one document --
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. -- that shows at least one company targeting the
- 12 youth of America?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 14 BY MR. MANNING:
- 15 Q. Correct?
- 16 A. I've seen those documents.
- 17 Q. As well as targeting the youth of Minnesota;
- 18 correct?
- 19 A. I have not seen any reference to youth in
- 20 Minnesota, but I assume the youth of America being
- 21 targeted, meant the youth of Minnesota, as well.
- 22 Q. Right.
- 23 And you told me earlier that you would not want
- 24 to be a part of, in any way, shape, or form,
- 25 personally supporting or lending a hand to targeting

- 1 kids to smoke?
- 2 A. That is correct, I said that.
- 3 Q. You would find that reprehensible to be a part
- 4 of that yourself?
- 5 A. I find it reprehensible, yes, sir.
- 6 Q. And you find it reprehensible if the tobacco
- 7 companies do it, don't you?
- 8 A. Oh, certainly.
- 9 Q. And you think they ought to stop if they do,
- 10 don't you?
- 11 A. I certainly do.
- 12 Now I'm talking as a person, a citizen, not as
- 13 an expert witness in this proceeding.
- 14 Q. Showing you, sir, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 148.
- 15 Philip Morris document, inter-office correspondence,
- 16 Richmond, Virginia, from a Myron Johnston to a
- 17 Dr. R.B. Sellgman, May 21, '75; right?
- 18 A. That's what it says on the top, yes, sir.
- 19 Q. Down at the bottom when it says
- 20 "Demographics" -- do you see that?
- 21 A. Yes, sir. I do see that.
- 22 Q. "It has been well-established by the National
- 23 Tracking Study and other studies that Marlboro has
- 24 for many years had its highest market penetration
- 25 among younger smokers. Most of these studies have

- 1 been restricted to people age eighteen and over. But
- 2 my own data, which includes younger teenagers, shows
- 3 even higher Marlboro market penetration among
- 4 fifteen- to seventeen-year-olds. The teenage years
- 5 are also important because those are the years during
- 6 which most smokers begin to smoke. The years in
- 7 which initial brand selections are made and the
- 8 period in the life cycle in which conformity to
- 9 peer group norms is greatest"; do you see that?
- 10 A. I do see that.
- 11 Q. Next page.
- 12 A. (Complying.)
- 13 Q. "It seemed reasonable to believe, therefore,
- 14 that there should be a relationship between the
- 15 number of fifteen- to nineteen-year-olds and Marlboro
- 16 sales during the period of Marlboro's rapid growth.
- 17 I started running some correlations and found some
- 18 interesting relationships, all significant at better
- 19 than the .005 level."
- 20 You understand that to be a statistical
- 21 correlation; right?
- 22 A. Yes, I do.
- 23 Q. Read the whole next page there, if you will.
- 24 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 25 Page three?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Q. No. All of page two.
- 2 A. Page two?
- 3 Q. I won't read it.
- 4 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 5 Q. All right, sir?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. You would at least agree with me that there is
- 8 someone here who's attempting to do a relatively
- 9 thorough statistical analysis on fifteen- to
- 10 nineteen-year-olds; correct?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. And they're doing it on -- in relationship to
- 13 Marlboro's share of market?
- 14 A. That's what this indicates, yes.
- 15 Q. Showing you, sir, what's been marked as
- 16 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 355 previously. This is, once
- 17 again, a Philip Morris document dated March 29, '79;
- 18 right?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 Q. It says here, "Marlboro represents 60% of
- 21 Philip Morris USA sales. The brand accounts for
- 22 one-third of all growth of Philip Morris USA. In
- 23 1978 a hundred one billion units were sold"; right?
- 24 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 25 Q. "The brand represents 17% of the national share

- 1 of cigarettes. One in five smokers smoke Marlboro";
- 2 right?
- 3 A. That's what it says.
- 4 Q. Last sentence, "It was the first brand to pass
- 5 one hundred billion units sold"; right?
- 6 A. That's what it says.
- 7 Q. "Demographics." It says, "Marlboro dominates --
- 8 dominates in the seventeen and younger age category,
- 9 capturing over 50%" -- and they use the word
- 10 capturing, don't they?
- 11 A. That's what it says.
- 12 Q. "...over 50% of this market. In the eighteen to
- 13 twenty-four age group Marlboro dominates with 30.7%
- 14 share"; right?
- 15 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 16 Q. So here now we have two Philip Morris documents
- 17 that we've seen, one I just showed you, and this one,
- 18 in which, again, similar to RJR, there is a focus on
- 19 thirteen-, fourteen-, fifteen-, sixteen-,
- 20 seventeen-year-old kids; correct?
- 21 A. That's what it indicates on the document, yes,
- 22 sir.
- 23 Q. It doesn't say, "Gosh, these kids are smoking
- 24 our cigarette. We better do something about this and
- 25 advertise and change this in some way"; does it?

- 1 A. No.
- 2 Q. In fact, what the prior document showed was a
- 3 statistical analysis of those kids and how it bore on
- 4 the future relation -- the future growth of the
- 5 company, didn't it?
- 6 A. That's what it said, yes, sir.
- 7 Q. And that's the same kind of reprehensible thing
- 8 that we talked about with RJR, isn't it?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. And on page two of this it says here...
- 11 We'll move on from that.
- 12 (Exhibit 3148 marked for identification.)
- 13 BY MR. MANNING:
- 14 Q. And on 3148 it says "Acknowledgment Receipt for
- 15 Confidential Report"; right?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. It says, "This report is confidential to the
- 18 business of the company. It should be carefully
- 19 handled and is not transferable to another individual
- 20 and is not to be photocopied"; do you see that?
- 21 A. Yes, I do.
- 22 Q. "If the report had served its purpose and is no
- 23 longer needed, please return it immediately to the
- 24 Central Files Section at the Research Center for
- 25 recordkeeping purposes and destruction"; right?

- 1 A. I see it, yes.
- 2 Q. That's a careful -- careful way in which to
- 3 handle documents, would you not agree?
- 4 A. I have no idea how companies handle documents.
- 5 That's not an area of my expertise.
- 6 Q. Right.
- 7 A. I've never done any corporate history.
- 8 Q. And this is copy number four, right?
- 9 A. According to the lower portion of it, it says
- 10 copy number four, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. And the title on the document, which is, -- you
- 12 acknowledge a receipt to get it for a confidential
- 13 report. You return it for recordkeeping and
- 14 destruction. The title of it is "Young Smokers
- 15 Prevalence Trends Implications"; right?
- 16 A. That's what it says.
- 17 Q. And the date is 1981, isn't it?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. Now showing you what's been marked as
- 20 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 358, KEYWORDS at the bottom, it
- 21 says, "Smoking Prevalence, Youth, Young Smokers,
- 22 Demographic Trends"; do you see that?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. And it's copy number four?
- 25 A. Copy -- yes. Copy number four, right.

- 1 Q. Issued to L. Meyer, the same name on the
- 2 acknowledgment receipt we saw on Deposition Exhibit
- 3 3148; right?
- 4 A. Issued -- I'm sorry. Oh yes. Issued to
- 5 L. Meyer. I have it.
- 6 Q. Same guy we saw there on 3148, right?
- 7 A. At least a man with the same initials and second
- 8 name, yes.
- 9 Q. If you look to the table of contents.
- 10 A. Yes, sir.
- 11 Q. "Summary"; right?
- 12 A. Uh-huh.
- 13 Q. Teen smoking prevalence from '68 to '74?
- 14 A. Right.
- 15 Q. Teen smoking prevalence, '75 to '80?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. "Smoking Prevalence and Educational
- 18 Aspirations"?
- 19 A. Yes.
- 20 Q. "Race Differences in Smoking Prevalence"?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. And on and on?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. Next page, please.
- 25 A. Uh-huh.

- 1 Q. "Summary." It says here, "It is important to
- 2 know as much as possible about teenage smoking
- 3 patterns and attitudes"?
- 4 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 5 Q. "Today's teenager is tomorrow's potential
- 6 regular smoker"?
- 7 A. Customer.
- 8 Q. Customer. Thank you.
- 9 Also would be a smoker, right?
- 10 A. Oh, of course. I mean they're not selling, you
- 11 know, bagels.
- 12 Q. You got it.
- "...and the overwhelming majority of smokers
- 14 first begin to smoke while still in their teens"; do
- 15 you see that?
- 16 A. Yes, I do.
- 17 Q. That's a tobacco company that knows that, isn't
- 18 it? They know that, don't they?
- 19 A. I would assume they did.
- 20 Q. They're stating it in the first two sentences of
- 21 the summary of this strictly confidential document?
- 22 A. I would think so, yes, sir.
- 23 Q. That you have to sign out to get somehow, right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. That is telling people in the company don't copy

- 1 it?
- 2 A. That's right.
- 3 Q. "In addition," it says, "the ten years following
- 4 the teenage years is the period during which average
- 5 daily consumption per smoker increases to the average
- 6 adult level"?
- 7 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. "The smoking patterns of teenagers are
- 9 particularly important to Philip Morris"; do you see
- 10 that?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. That's in 1981, isn't it?
- 13 A. That's correct. Yes, '81.
- 14 Q. They're emphasizing teenagers here in this
- 15 document, aren't they?
- 16 A. In this particular document it seems so, yes.
- 17 Q. It sure does.
- 18 "Of the eleven packings of which the median age
- 19 of smokers is under age thirty, seven are
- 20 Philip Morris packings and the share index is highest
- 21 in the youngest age group for all Marlboro and
- 22 Virginia Slims packings and for B&H Lights and
- 23 Menthol"; right?
- 24 A. That's what it says.
- 25 Q. "Furthermore, it is during the teenage years

- 1 that the initial brand choice is made"; correct?
- 2 A. That's what it says.
- 3 Q. "At least a part of the success of Marlboro Red
- 4 during its most rapid growth period was because it
- 5 became the brand choice among teenagers who then
- 6 stuck with it as they grew older. This, combined
- 7 with the rapid growth in the absolute number of
- 8 teenagers"; right?
- 9 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. "Between '67 and '76 the number of fifteen- to
- 11 nineteen-year-olds in the U.S. increased 18% and
- 12 there was also an increase during at least part of
- 13 that period in the percent of teenagers who smoked
- 14 cigarettes"; right?
- 15 A. That's what it says.
- 16 Q. Continuing, it says, "Average daily consumption
- 17 of these young smokers also increased, so that
- 18 between '68 and '74 the number of twelve- to
- 19 eighteen-year-olds who smoked ten or more cigarettes
- 20 a day more than doubled"; right?
- 21 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. This is one of the first times you've at least
- 23 seen twelve-year-olds referred to; right?
- 24 A. Yes, in this document.
- 25 Q. Or in other documents?

- 1 A. That's right.
- 2 Q. Prior to this, the lowest you saw reference was
- 3 fourteen and fifteen; right?
- 4 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 5 Q. But now Philip Morris is referencing
- 6 twelve-year-olds?
- 7 A. In this document.
- 8 Q. Yeah.
- 9 "Industry sales were also aided by the fact
- 10 that this period was one of rapid increase in the
- 11 number of people aged twenty to twenty-four -- ages
- 12 during which average daily consumption increases";
- 13 right?
- 14 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 15 Q. Turn two pages, please.
- 16 A. Uh-huh.
- 17 Page three, is that the --
- 18 Q. Yes, sir.
- Now we have a table in which the ages are broken
- 20 down even a little more clearly by Philip Morris. We
- 21 have twelve- to fourteen-year-olds; right?
- 22 A. On table one?
- 23 Q. Yes.
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Then we have fifteen- to sixteen-year-olds;

- 1 right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. Then we have seventeen- to eighteen-year-olds?
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. And there's a lot of data there, percent who are
- 6 current regular smokers, on and on; right?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- 8 Q. No doubt in your mind as you look at this
- 9 document that there's a thorough analysis going on by
- 10 Philip Morris of teenagers, is there?
- 11 A. I don't know how thorough, but there is an
- 12 analysis going on about teenagers, yes.
- 13 Q. Just thumb through the rest of the document, if
- 14 you will.
- 15 A. Surely.
- 16 Q. Just kind of thumb through it, take a minute,
- 17 and...
- 18 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 19 Q. Sir, all I'm saying is --
- 20 A. I am sorry.
- 21 Q. There's two attachments to the document, right?
- 22 Attachment A and Attachment B. Graphs, charts,
- 23 population trends, on and on, right?
- 24 A. Attachment B has charts, yes, I see that.
- 25 Q. Attachment A is a description of data sources,

- 1 right?
- 2 A. Attachment A is a description of data sources,
- 3 yes.
- 4 Q. And then look at page fifteen.
- 5 A. Fifteen? Yes, sir. I have it.
- 6 Q. Here they even analyze the school grade in which
- 7 seniors first begin smoking on a daily basis by race,
- 8 breaking it out white and black. From '76 to '79.
- 9 They go all the way down to grade six, don't they?
- 10 A. That's right.
- 11 Q. They skip grade seven, but they've got grade
- 12 eight and grade nine there, don't they?
- 13 A. Pardon me?
- 14 Q. They skip grade seven, but they have grade eight
- 15 and grade nine there, don't they?
- 16 A. Yeah, they do.
- 17 Q. So, sir, on your review of this document, if
- 18 someone said -- for example, somebody from
- 19 Philip Morris said, "We're not interested in the
- 20 young smoker, and we don't target the young smoker,
- 21 and they're of no interest to us, and it's an adult
- 22 habit, and all we want is adults," based on your
- 23 review of this document you would at least have grave
- 24 questions about the truth of that statement, wouldn't
- 25 you?

- 1 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 2 THE WITNESS: Yes.
- 3 BY MR. MANNING:
- 4 Q. In fact, based on your review of this document
- 5 and the other documents that I've shown you here, if
- 6 someone from Philip Morris made the statement, "We're
- 7 not interested in young kids smoking at all. We're
- 8 only interested in adults," you would also conclude
- 9 that's a lie, wouldn't you?
- 10 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 11 BY MR. MANNING:
- 12 Q. You'd have to?
- 13 A. I would conclude that they were saying things
- 14 that were contrary to what I believed to be the known
- 15 facts about smoking and health, yes.
- 16 Q. And if they said they're not interested in --
- 17 A. Oh, I'm sorry.
- 18 Q. -- in targeting kids --
- 19 A. Then, no. Then I would conclude, on the basis
- 20 of just a casual look at this document, and I must
- 21 say it was a casual look, and the other documents
- 22 that you showed me, that certainly they were
- 23 interested in the young adult market.
- Now, I'm saying this not as a historian, because
- 25 I haven't done any historical research on this.

- 1 Q. I understand.
- 2 A. Nor as a marketing specialist. I'm not a
- 3 marketing specialist.
- 4 Nor as a statistician. I'm not a statistician.
- 5 I'm saying it in response to your request for me to
- 6 look at portions of this document and give you my
- 7 human response.
- 8 Q. Correct. That's what we hope, is that all
- 9 experts are all people?
- 10 A. Absolutely.
- 11 Q. Executives?
- 12 A. Exactly.
- 13 Q. Lawyers, and everyone, always remain human.
- 14 A. Exactly.
- 15 Q. And remain human beings.
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. And testify and do things always as
- 18 human beings?
- 19 A. Absolutely.
- 20 Q. And as a human being you would agree that based
- 21 on this document and on other documents you've seen
- 22 here, just the last two or three, with respect to
- 23 Philip Morris, I won't talk about Reynolds, we
- 24 already did that, that if they said publicly we're
- 25 not interested in kids, we don't target kids, we're

- 1 not interested in kids smoking, we're only interested
- 2 in adults, these documents would contradict that
- 3 statement?
- 4 A. It would.
- 5 Q. And so, if they made that statement publicly, by
- 6 these documents contradicting that statement, if they
- 7 made the public statement, they're not interested in
- 8 kids, it would be a lie?
- 9 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Wouldn't it?
- 12 A. Well, I would need more evidence than that.
- 13 Q. Yeah. You'd want to see if the pattern
- 14 persisted over a period of time?
- 15 A. And if there's any reasonable explanation for
- 16 the discrepancy, yes.
- 17 Q. Sure.
- One of the ways that you would find whether
- 19 there was a reasonable explanation for the
- 20 discrepancy is you could ask people at the tobacco
- 21 companies, couldn't you?
- 22 A. I'm not interested.
- 23 Q. I know that.
- Just not interested?
- 25 A. Not interested.

- 1 Not interested as a historian.
- 2 Q. Right. But as a human being you're interested
- 3 to not support kids becoming addicted?
- 4 A. That's right.
- 5 Q. Showing you, sir, Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1058;
- 6 okay?
- 7 A. Uh-huh.
- 8 Q. It's an RJR document, right, the front?
- 9 A. Yes, an RJR document.
- 10 Q. And it's titled "Secret Number Fifteen"; right?
- 11 A. That's what it says on the cover, right.
- 12 Q. And it says, "Implications and Activities
- 13 Arising From Correlation of Smoke pH With Nicotine
- 14 Impact, Other Smoke Qualities, and Cigarette Sales";
- 15 do you see that?
- 16 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 17 Q. Just take a look at the second page and look at
- 18 the Table --
- 19 A. Second page.
- 20 Q. -- Table of Contents there.
- 21 A. Beyond the Table of Contents?
- 22 Q. No. Just look at the Table of Contents.
- 23 A. Oh. Table of Contents. I'm sorry.
- 24 Q. Let's take a short break and come back to this.
- 25 A. Sorry?

- 1 MR. PURVIS: He wants to take a break.
- 2 (Recess taken.)
- 3 BY MR. MANNING:
- 4 Q. Doctor, I just stumbled across --
- 5 MR. MANNING: Back on the record.
- 6 BY MR. MANNING:
- 7 Q. I just stumbled across a document in the
- 8 documents that were given to me from your files last
- 9 night in which there's a Post-It on one.
- 10 A. Is there?
- 11 Q. Yeah. I'm showing it to you. It says,
- 12 "Dr. Berman, I need to talk to you about other
- 13 sources I've stumbled across, Dave"; do you see that?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Do you have any memory what he stumbled across?
- 16 A. No, I don't recall.
- 17 Oh, this was in the Harold Diehl Library. I
- 18 think he stumbled across some Diehl material having
- 19 to do with -- additional material having to do with
- 20 smoking and health. This is my best recollection.
- 21 I'm not sure.
- 22 Q. You don't know, for example, if he stumbled
- 23 across some tobacco company documents on the
- 24 Internet?
- 25 A. No, sir.

- 1 He would have told me that if he did and he
- 2 didn't.
- 3 Q. You don't remember him telling you that?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. You don't recall whether he stumbled across
- 6 Kluger's book "From Ashes to Ashes"?
- 7 A. Oh, he knew of its existence. It was on my
- 8 desk.
- 9 Q. I thought you said it was on your book shelf and
- 10 you didn't know --
- 11 A. Well, on the book shelf on the top of my desk,
- 12 yes, sir.
- 13 Q. And he saw it there?
- 14 A. I assume he did. It wasn't hidden.
- 15 Q. You don't know whether he read it?
- 16 A. I have no idea whether he read it or not, no.
- No, to the best of my recollection it had to do
- 18 with Dean Diehl.
- 19 Q. Thank you. Now, --
- 20 A. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. -- going on to that document marked 1058, right?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. If you look at that -- under Roman Numeral
- 24 Number II, second paragraph.
- 25 A. On Roman II, yes.

- 1 Q. Okay?
- 2 A. Yes, I have it.
- 3 Do you want me to read it?
- 4 Q. Please.
- 5 I'm not going to read it out loud.
- 6 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 7 Q. What I'd like you to do, Doctor, is read
- 8 Roman Numeral Number II there in its entirety.
- 9 A. I'm halfway through.
- 10 Q. I understand.
- 11 And then go over and read Roman Numeral
- 12 Number III, as well, --
- 13 A. Okay.
- 14 Q. -- in its entirety.
- 15 A. Roman Numeral II and III in its entirety.
- 16 Q. Yes. III on page two of the document, just so
- 17 the record is clear. And then we don't have to read
- 18 in exactly what it is.
- 19 Go ahead.
- 20 A. Okay.
- 21 (Reviewing document.)
- 22 I've finished reading.
- 23 Q. Now is this the first time that you have read
- 24 anything on the topic of smoke pH and free nicotine?
- 25 A. That is absolutely correct.

- 1 Q. You've not seen the topic of smoke pH and free
- 2 nicotine reported in your historical analysis in the
- 3 press?
- 4 A. I don't recall having seen that.
- 5 Q. You don't recall seeing anything from the
- 6 tobacco companies that was quoted in the press on
- 7 this topic of smoke pH and free nicotine?
- 8 A. I don't recall seeing that, no, sir.
- 9 Q. And do you find it educational? I mean it
- 10 educates you on the issue?
- 11 A. Oh, yesterday you asked me about free nicotine
- 12 and I said I didn't know about it. Now, having read
- 13 the definition, I know something about it. Thank you
- 14 for informing me.
- 15 Q. So what it says here is, "Thus," in the second
- 16 paragraph under Roman Numeral Number III, --
- 17 A. Second paragraph of --
- 18 Q. Roman Numeral Number III.
- 19 The third sentence says, "Thus, Marlboro and
- 20 Kool smokes contain more 'free' nicotine than our
- 21 comparable brands; hence, would be expected to show
- 22 more instantaneous nicotine kick than our normal
- 23 brands. Charts XI and XII show these relationships,
- 24 along with some comparative sales data to be
- 25 discussed later"; right?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. That's what it says.
- 2 Q. If you turn to the next page, under
- 3 Roman Numeral Number V, "Marketing Correlations and
- 4 Implications"; --
- 5 A. Uh-huh.
- 6 Q. -- in the second paragraph, second sentence, it
- 7 says, "Our preliminary correlations strongly suggest
- 8 that this is the case and that the vigorous sustained
- 9 sale in growth of sales of Marlboro and other
- 10 Philip Morris brands and Kool correlates closely with
- 11 the increased smoke pH, hence increased 'free'
- 12 nicotine and nicotine impact of those brands. The
- 13 accompanying reduction in mouth irritation and stemmy
- 14 taste, and the increased burley character may also be
- 15 factors"; right?
- 16 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 17 Q. Again, you don't have any recollection of the
- 18 tobacco companies discussing free nicotine with the
- 19 press or with the public in any way?
- 20 A. I have no such recollection, no.
- 21 Q. And then if you look at Roman Numeral VI,
- 22 "Present RJR Brand Activity." If our data,
- 23 correlations and conclusions are valid, then what has
- 24 emerged is a rather new type of cigarette,
- 25 represented by Marlboro and Kool, with high nicotine

- 1 kick, burley flavor, mildness to the mouth, and
- 2 increased sensation to the throat, all largely the
- 3 result of higher smoke pH." Do you see that?
- 4 A. I see that, yes.
- 5 Q. And in going back to page two, the third
- 6 paragraph, under Roman Numeral Number III, --
- 7 A. Third paragraph under III, yes.
- 8 Q. You see that, "As a result of its higher smoke
- 9 pH, the current Marlboro, despite a two-thirds
- 10 reduction in smoke tar and nicotine over the years,
- 11 calculates to have essentially the same amount of
- 12 free nicotine in its smoke as did the early Winston";
- 13 do you see that?
- 14 A. I do.
- 15 Q. This document would suggest to you, as a
- 16 historian, that the issue of free nicotine -- if you
- 17 were going to do any historic analysis, you would
- 18 want to do much further work to understand free
- 19 nicotine, exactly what it is in relation to pH value
- 20 and its impact on sales and on and on, right?
- 21 A. If I were doing a marketing survey, or a history
- 22 of marketing, or a history of the corporation, of
- 23 tobacco industry, I certainly would want to know that
- 24 and I would certainly want to consult appropriate
- 25 scientists who are capable and competent in the field

- 1 of whatever chemistry, biology, is involved in this.
- 2 Q. Okay.
- 3 A. I am not capable of commenting in that area.
- 4 (Exhibit 3149 marked for identification.)
- 5 BY MR. MANNING:
- 6 Q. Showing you, sir, what's been marked as
- 7 Exhibit 3149; okay?
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. It's a memo from Michael Brozek to Roger
- 10 Mozingo, via electronic mail, April 11, '85; right?
- 11 A. That's correct.
- 12 Q. The re on it is a "Minnesota Legislative
- 13 Status"; right?
- 14 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 15 Q. It looks like a Brown and Williamson document;
- 16 right?
- 17 A. B and W on the top, yes.
- 18 Q. In fact, if we go to the document on
- 19 "Background" --
- 20 A. Background, yes, sir.
- 21 Q. We've seen some other documents about this time
- 22 about lobbying, haven't we?
- 23 A. '85?
- 24 Q. Yes, sir.
- 25 A. Yes, sir. I saw one -- at least one that you've

- 1 shown me.
- 2 Q. Right.
- 3 A. Portions of which you've shown me.
- 4 Q. This is now a Brown and Williamson document;
- 5 right?
- 6 A. That is correct.
- 7 Q. It says, "Since January, as you know, the
- 8 situation -- under background. "As you know, the
- 9 situation in Minnesota has been uncommonly active. A
- 10 raft of legislative issues in the form of taxation,
- 11 regulation, and prohibitions have found their way
- 12 through the Minnesota legislative process." Do you
- 13 see that?
- 14 A. Yes, I do.
- 15 Q. Keep going down. I'm going to shift down.
- 16 A. Sorry.
- 17 Q. On the right-hand side -- I'm going to shift
- 18 down to here to where it says "The ink..."
- 19 A. Where it says -- I'm sorry?
- Oh, "The ink..." I see. Yes.
- 21 Q. Then it says, "The ink was not yet dry on this
- 22 report before our lobbyists initiated an aggressive
- 23 and focused effort in communication with legislative
- 24 leadership and targeted key legislative activists.
- 25 This effort was successful in preventing a majority

- 1 of the report from seeing its way from the drafting
- 2 board to a legislator's hand." Do you see that?
- 3 A. I do.
- 4 Q. So now that tells you that clearly these
- 5 lobbying efforts of the tobacco industry were having
- 6 an impact on what was going from the drafting board
- 7 to the legislator's hands?
- 8 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 9 THE WITNESS: That's what Mr. Michael Brozek
- 10 says.
- 11 BY MR. MANNING:
- 12 Q. Right. And, in fact, the way you interpret that
- 13 is things that would be prevented from getting to the
- 14 drafting board, to the legislator's hand, then
- 15 wouldn't find their way into a legislative hearing,
- 16 would they?
- 17 A. That is correct. Because it doesn't go through
- 18 the legislative drafting process, the revisor's
- 19 office, then it would not appear on the calendar of
- 20 either the House or the Senate. Yes, sir.
- 21 Q. So those things wouldn't be available to you in
- 22 your historical review, would they?
- 23 A. No, they would be. They'd be available if we
- 24 examined the -- as we have, the committee proceedings
- 25 that dealt with tobacco issues that -- committee

- 1 proceedings would not have the legislative drafting
- 2 process yet. And it could -- it could have fallen
- 3 out somewhere along there in the proceedings. I'm
- 4 familiar with that, unfortunately, from firsthand
- 5 experience.
- 6 Q. Now --
- 7 A. May I modify that?
- 8 Not everything would go through the committee
- 9 structure.
- 10 Q. On --
- 11 A. So, therefore, it is possible that we missed
- 12 some of it, yes.
- 13 Q. Sure. Because not -- particularly as is talked
- 14 about here, things that were on the drafting board
- 15 may not -- that were changed, may not find their way
- 16 into the committee hearings?
- 17 A. That is possible. Yes, sir. I amend my answer
- 18 with that observation, sir.
- 19 Q. And it's clear that they were attempting to
- 20 impact the process as early as the drafting board?
- 21 A. According to Mr. Brozek, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. And then, if you turn, if you will, to page
- 23 nine.
- 24 A. Page nine?
- 25 Q. Nine. Yeah.

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. And it says there on page nine that "Every
- 3 possible legislative, political, social, and
- 4 theoretical angle is being utilized in our efforts to
- 5 get out of this session unscathed"; do you see that?
- 6 A. Yes, I do.
- 7 Q. "Since Minnesota has seen fit to designate
- 8 itself as Surgeon General Koop stated, 'A model for
- 9 the country" with regard to anti-smoking legislation,
- 10 our only choice in this matter is a complete
- 11 victory"; do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. "Anything less could be used against us in other
- 14 states"; right?
- 15 A. That's right.
- 16 Q. "We will employ all means to secure that
- 17 victory."
- 18 A. So the document states, yes.
- 19 Q. And that's from Michael Brozek to Michael
- 20 Mozingo?
- 21 A. Exactly.
- 22 Q. In April of '85?
- 23 A. Right.
- 24 Q. At least before today you were not aware of the
- 25 strength of the commitment of a complete victory in

- 1 the legislative arena before you saw these documents?
- 2 A. I've never seen reference to complete victory.
- 3 (Exhibit 3150 marked for identification.)
- 4 BY MR. MANNING:
- 5 Q. Now, sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 6 Deposition Exhibit 3150, you see a 1988 Minnesota
- 7 Legislative Plan and a Minnesota 1987 Legislative
- 8 Overview; right?
- 9 A. That's correct.
- 10 Q. If you go down to the third paragraph, "Did we
- 11 have the best lobbying team?" Do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. It says, The drafter of this document" -- let's
- 14 find out who it is.
- Woops. No name, huh?
- 16 A. No name.
- 17 Q. We don't know who drafted it?
- 18 A. Mr. Anonymous, then.
- 19 Q. Yeah.
- 20 A. Or Ms. Anonymous.
- 21 Q. Sure.
- 22 And it says, "My answer," Did we have the best
- 23 lobbying team? "My answer would have to be, without
- 24 equivocation, yes, absolutely. Our lobbying team,
- 25 consisting of Tom Kelm, Andrew Kozak, and David

- 1 Horasdovsky, a firm known as North State Advisers,
- 2 Inc., are considered in almost every circle to be the
- 3 most effective and most respected lobbying team in
- 4 the state of Minnesota"; do you see that?
- 5 A. I do.
- 6 Q. Are you familiar with Mr. Kelm?
- 7 A. Yes, I am.
- 8 Q. Do you know him?
- 9 A. Yes, I do.
- 10 Q. Did he serve under Mr. Perpich?
- 11 A. No, he did not.
- 12 Q. Under who did he serve?
- 13 A. Under Governor Anderson.
- 14 Q. Did you know him when he was with
- 15 Governor Anderson?
- 16 A. Yes, I did.
- 17 Q. Did you work with him?
- 18 A. No, I did not.
- 19 Q. Did you work with him when he formed Northern
- 20 States Advisers?
- 21 A. No, I did not.
- 22 Q. Are you aware that he did so?
- 23 A. I'm aware that he had a lobbying,
- 24 public relations operation. That it was called
- 25 Northern State, I did not know.

- 1 Q. And you were aware that he was one of the most
- 2 respected lobbyists?
- 3 A. I was aware that he had a good reputation as a
- 4 lobbyist, yes, sir. Whether it was the most
- 5 respected one I wouldn't know.
- 6 Q. Were you aware before today that he worked for
- 7 the tobacco industry?
- 8 A. I think I had some knowledge of that before
- 9 today, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. How did you know that?
- 11 A. I think through word of mouth, from around.
- 12 Different people. Friends like D.J. Leary, who is a
- 13 respected political observer on the Minnesota scene.
- 14 Let's put it -- through word of mouth. Let's
- 15 put it that way.
- 16 Q. So you know D.J.?
- 17 A. Pardon me?
- 18 Q. You know D.J. Leary?
- 19 A. I certainly do know D.J.
- 20 Q. You know Wy Spano?
- 21 A. Oh, Wy -- I'm on his doctoral committee, yes,
- 22 sir.
- 23 Q. Is he getting his doctorate now?
- 24 A. He's getting his doctorate in political science.
- 25 Q. Good for him.

- 1 And you know a lot of political people in the
- 2 state of Minnesota by your appearing on Almanac,
- 3 et cetera; correct?
- 4 A. I would say I know a good number of them, yes.
- 5 I wouldn't say all, obviously.
- 6 Q. But you know a good number?
- 7 A. Yes. I worked with a good number, as well.
- 8 Q. Right. And you knew Tom Kelm was a lobbyist for
- 9 the tobacco industry?
- 10 A. Yes, I did.
- 11 Q. And you were involved in a historical analysis
- 12 for --
- 13 A. That is correct.
- 14 Q. -- the tobacco industry?
- 15 A. Not for the tobacco industry.
- 16 Q. Well, you knew that --
- 17 Let's talk, so we don't get hung up in things,
- 18 let's say when we come to that issue, sort of shorten
- 19 it and paraphrase and say we know the money went into
- 20 your pockets from the tobacco industry?
- 21 A. I was doing research on the awareness of the
- 22 people of Minnesota and the state regarding health
- 23 hazards of smoking.
- Now the fact that the funds came from the
- 25 tobacco industry, is an incidental factor, yes, sir.

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Q. Incidental factor?
- 2 A. Incidental factor for me as a historian because
- 3 I was independent, free to do my research, without
- 4 interference or without any kind of oversight and
- 5 guidance by anyone.
- 6 Q. Right. And, of course, who the money came from
- 7 has absolutely no impact, I'm sure you will tell me
- 8 this, on broadening the question that you want to
- 9 research? It has no impact?
- 10 A. No impact whatsoever, sir.
- 11 Q. And --
- 12 A. I'm not a corporate historian, nor am I
- 13 interested in what the industry does, except in its
- 14 public presentation.
- 15 Q. But you could have easily, in your historic
- 16 analysis, called Tom Kelm, who you knew worked for
- 17 the tobacco industry, and asked him about what his
- 18 efforts and what his knowledge was on lobbying
- 19 efforts on behalf of the tobacco industry? You could
- 20 have easily done that?
- 21 A. Oh, I certainly could have.
- 22 Q. If you would have called him, he would have
- 23 returned your call?
- 24 A. He certainly would have.
- 25 Q. If you asked him to go to lunch, I'm sure he

- 1 would have gone to lunch with you?
- 2 A. Most probably.
- 3 Q. You didn't do that?
- 4 A. No, I did not.
- 5 Q. This author goes on and says, after saying
- 6 they're the best, "Their access to legislative
- 7 offices is unparalleled"; do you see that?
- 8 A. I see that, yes, sir.
- 9 Q. "Their system of political influence is second
- 10 to none."
- 11 A. I see that.
- 12 Q. "As a matter of fact, our lobbyists have, in
- 13 their own firm, a registered political action
- 14 committee which contributes over fifty thousand
- 15 dollars annually to legislative races and
- 16 constitutional officer races"; do you see that?
- 17 A. I see that.
- 18 Q. Next page. Page two.
- 19 A. Page three? Page two?
- 20 Q. Page two. Second sentence.
- 21 A. Second sentence.
- 22 Q. "As a matter of fact, during the session regular
- 23 daily meetings were held in the Capitol rotunda at
- 24 2:00 p.m. for all tobacco family participants"; do
- 25 you see that?

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. You go down further there -- you see the
- 3 paragraph that says, "Finally, concerning our
- 4 lobbying efforts..."
- 5 A. Yes, I do see that paragraph.
- 6 Q. "...each lobbyist was assigned a specific
- 7 legislator, committee, administration agency head,"
- 8 right on down; right?
- 9 A. Yes, I see that.
- 10 Q. There was a bill there on smoking restrictions
- 11 slash schools?
- 12 A. I'm sorry?
- 13 Q. See House file 227?
- 14 A. House file number six --
- 15 Q. 227.
- 16 A. 227. Yes, sir. Smoking restrictions.
- 17 Q. Slash schools, right?
- 18 A. Pardon?
- 19 Q. Smoking restrictions slash schools?
- 20 A. Slash schools, yes, I see that.
- 21 Q. You don't know what position these lobbyists
- 22 took on that?
- 23 A. I have no idea.
- 24 Q. You didn't run across this in your historical
- 25 research?

- 1 A. Nope.
- 2 Q. Next page. Please read that entire third page,
- 3 if you will.
- 4 A. Sorry?
- 5 Q. Please read the third whole page.
- 6 A. Whole third page?
- 7 Q. Yep.
- 8 A. Okay.
- 9 (Reviewing document.)
- 10 I have read it.
- 11 Q. Were you aware that in 1987 this type of
- 12 extensive efforts were being organized by the tobacco
- 13 industry?
- 14 A. Was I aware in terms of my own personal
- 15 knowledge of this?
- 16 Q. Yes, sir.
- 17 A. No, I was not aware of that. But it doesn't
- 18 surprise me.
- 19 Q. Did you become aware of this extensive efforts
- 20 going on by the tobacco industry during your
- 21 historical analysis?
- 22 A. No, I was not.
- 23 Q. So during your historical analysis you did not
- 24 know that they had a program in which four thousand
- 25 people were contacting their legislators?

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 A. No, I did not.
- 2 Q. You didn't know that they had a targeted letter
- 3 writing campaign?
- 4 A. No, I did not. But it doesn't surprise me.
- 5 Q. You weren't aware that there was a specific
- 6 phone bank effort --
- 7 A. No.
- 8 Q. -- directed to convenience stores?
- 9 A. No, I did not know that. But, again, it doesn't
- 10 surprise me. These are typical and normal patterns
- 11 of lobbyists' behavior.
- 12 Q. On to page four, please.
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. In the first paragraph, about -- down about five
- 15 lines, do you see the sentence that says, "Even
- 16 though we literally blanketed, " do you see that?
- 17 A. I'm sorry.
- 18 Q. Even though --
- 19 A. Oh yeah, I've got it.
- 20 Q. Even though we literally blanketed the state of
- 21 Minnesota with industry generated, professionally
- 22 prepared, targeted and timed grass roots activity,
- 23 the missing factor was the human component"; do you
- 24 see that?
- 25 A. Yes, I do.

- 1 Q. Going down further, the sentence about four up
- 2 from the bottom of that paragraph. "Our lobbyists
- 3 can only do -- "
- 4 A. I'm sorry. Oh, okay. Uh-huh.
- 5 Q. "Our lobbyists can only do so much. Our phone
- 6 bankers can only do so much. Our industry media
- 7 experts can only do so much, but when a legislator
- 8 has to say no to a friend, that legislator will think
- 9 twice about saying no."
- 10 A. Yes, I see that.
- 11 (Exhibit 3151 marked for identification.)
- MR. MANNING: Before we begin, can I take a
- 13 two-minute break?
- 14 (Recess taken.)
- 15 BY MR. MANNING:
- 16 Q. Showing you, sir, what was marked as --
- 17 exhibit number again?
- 18 A. 3151.
- 19 Q. Thank you.
- 20 It's a thick document, right?
- 21 A. Very thick.
- 22 Q. Couple of inches, right?
- 23 A. At least.
- 24 Q. And the title of it is "Camel Y&R Orientation"?
- 25 A. "Camel Y&R Orientation," yes, sir.

- 1 Q. If you turn to the next page?
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. It's produced by RJR, right?
- 4 A. Uh-huh.
- 5 Q. In the Humphrey litigation, right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Number one it says, "Strategic Importance of YAS
- 8 and Summary of YAS Learning"; right?
- 9 A. That's what it says, yes, sir.
- 10 Q. Number two is "Guidelines for Effective
- 11 Marketing to YAS"?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 Q. Do you know what those are?
- 14 A. No, I do not.
- 15 Q. Is YAS young adult smokers?
- 16 A. Oh, okay. I'm not familiar with the acronyms of
- 17 the marketing, so if we come to acronyms, if you'd
- 18 spell it out for me, I'd appreciate that.
- 19 Q. You've seen the words "young adult smokers"?
- 20 A. Oh certainly. Certainly. But I have not before
- 21 seen the acronym YAS, Y-A-S.
- 22 Q. If you can turn back three pages.
- 23 A. (Complying.)
- 24 Q. It says, "Each year one million new adult
- 25 smokers enter the cigarette market"; right?

- 1 A. Yes. That's what it says, yes.
- 2 Q. Number two, "YAS, or young adult smokers, are
- 3 the only source of replacement smokers"; right?
- 4 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 5 Q. " -- less than one-third of smokers start after
- 6 age eighteen"; do you see that?
- 7 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 8 Q. "Only 5% of smokers start after age
- 9 twenty-four"?
- 10 A. Yeah.
- 11 Q. Right?
- 12 A. What it says.
- 13 Q. So if you take those two statements together and
- 14 you're interested in selling as many cigarettes as
- 15 possible, and if only 5% start after twenty-four, and
- 16 less than one-third start after age eighteen, it
- 17 underscores the importance of getting the kids under
- 18 eighteen, doesn't it?
- 19 A. If I were selling cigarettes.
- 20 Q. Yes.
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Right. And this is one of the early documents
- 23 in this two inch stack of documents under the title
- 24 "Younger Adult Smokers--Strategic Importance";
- 25 right?

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. Now so far we don't have a date on this
- 3 document, do we?
- 4 A. No, we do not. At least I haven't seen one. I
- 5 see dates on the table below that, but no...
- 6 Q. So at least this one goes up to 1988, right?
- 7 A. That is correct. But no date when it was
- 8 generated, yes.
- 9 Q. Then under three it says, "First Usual Brand
- 10 Younger Adult Smokers," which we learned yesterday
- 11 was FUBYAS; right?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. "...drive the growth of Marlboro and Newport."
- 14 A. Uh-huh.
- 15 Q. Number four, it says, "The value of FUBYAS
- 16 compounds over time due to extreme brand loyalty and
- 17 rate per day increases"; right?
- 18 A. That's what it says.
- 19 Q. "Of all smokers who chose Marlboro as a first
- 20 usual brand in the mid '70s, 41% still smoke the
- 21 brand."
- 22 A. That's what it says, yes.
- 23 Q. Would you thumb through this document, sir?
- 24 A. Oh, sure.
- 25 Q. Please. I'm sorry?

- 1 A. I don't think I could gain very much by thumbing
- 2 through it. It looks like a very complex document.
- 3 But I shall thumb through it at your request.
- 4 Q. Now, for the second time, I'm going to ask you
- 5 to thumb through it a little quicker.
- 6 A. Okay.
- 7 Q. Go through it a little quicker. I'm not going
- 8 to ask any more questions about any pages.
- 9 A. Okay.
- 10 Q. Essentially it appears to be a complex, indepth,
- 11 marketing document, does it not?
- 12 A. Yes, sir.
- 13 I think I've seen part of it before. You showed
- 14 it to me yesterday, if I--
- 15 Q. You recall a similar document, in format?
- 16 A. No, I think I actually -- specific, exact same
- 17 pages. One page here, two very different examples of
- 18 successful brand strategies, "Jack Daniel's -- the
- 19 Marlboro of Bourbons, " and "Budweiser -- turning a
- 20 big brand around." I've seen that.
- 21 Q. Yep.
- 22 A. You showed it to me.
- 23 Q. Right.
- 24 A. I just wanted to indicate to you that I've seen
- 25 at least part of it before.

- 1 Q. Let me represent to you it's a different
- 2 document, but I understand what you're saying.
- 3 A. It looks like -- that page looks identical.
- 4 Q. Right.
- 5 A. Yeah.
- 6 Q. Okay. It's a complex marketing, indepth
- 7 document?
- 8 A. Absolutely. Yes. Exactly.
- 9 Q. And we talked about the first pages of it.
- 10 A. Uh-huh.
- 11 Q. Okay. Put it aside.
- 12 A. (Complying.)
- 13 Q. I'm going to show you Plaintiffs' Exhibit 1043.
- 14 Okay?
- 15 A. Uh-huh.
- 16 Q. Now here's a document, three pages, by Cliff
- 17 Pennell to Mr. R.M. Sanders?
- 18 A. From Cliff Pennell to Mr. R.M. Sanders, that's
- 19 correct.
- 20 Q. Dated February of 1989, right?
- 21 A. February 9, 1989, yes, sir.
- 22 Q. The re is "Camel Performance Opportunities"?
- 23 A. That's what it says.
- 24 Q. The first bullet point under "Current
- 25 Performance" --

- 1 A. Uh-huh. Do you want me to read that?
- 2 Q. Just that first paragraph.
- 3 A. Okay. Surely.
- 4 (Reviewing document.)
- 5 Yes, sir, I've read it.
- 6 Q. If you go to the second page.
- 7 A. Second?
- 8 Q. Please.
- 9 A. Second bullet point?
- 10 Q. Second page?
- 11 A. Second page. Third bullet point down.
- 12 Q. Second sentence. "Both the 75th Birthday and
- 13 Smooth Character Campaigns have been confirmed as
- 14 being extremely impactful advertising among target
- 15 smokers. Obviously, perceptions cannot be changed
- 16 overnight, but Camel has moved a long way in this
- 17 area in a very short period of time."
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. Do you see that?
- 20 A. I do.
- 21 Q. "Strategic Marketing Department has indicated
- 22 that in order to reach and convert younger adult
- 23 smokers, a brand must provide relevant
- 24 advertising/promotional activity that is presented in
- 25 a big and continuous manner with retail as the

- 1 primary vehicle"; do you see that?
- 2 A. Yes, I do.
- 3 Q. Go over to the next page.
- 4 A. Sorry?
- 5 Q. Next page.
- 6 A. Next page?
- 7 Q. Read that whole paragraph there, "In
- 8 conclusion..."
- 9 A. Okay.
- 10 (Reviewing document.)
- 11 Yes, I've read that paragraph.
- 12 Q. Now you saw that very large marketing document
- 13 that we just went through previously?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. The two-pager?
- 16 A. Yes, I saw the first few pages of that.
- 17 Q. And you thumbed through it and saw the
- 18 complexity and detail of analysis that was involved
- 19 in that document?
- 20 A. There's a lot of figures, yes, sir. Which I
- 21 haven't had a chance to really absorb.
- 22 Q. Right.
- 23 And that was a 1988 document, as far as we could
- 24 tell? At least the charts went up to '88?
- 25 A. At least the charts went up to '88. Could have

- 1 been '89 document.
- 2 Q. Right. I understand.
- 3 And this is a February of '89 document, correct?
- 4 A. That is correct.
- 5 Q. Are you aware of when the character Joe Camel
- 6 was introduced by RJR?
- 7 A. No, I don't.
- 8 Q. No idea?
- 9 A. I know it's within the last decade. But I have
- 10 no idea -- it may be longer ago than that. But I
- 11 have no knowledge of the exact date when it was
- 12 introduced, no, sir.
- 13 Q. So as a matter of your historical research that
- 14 you did here, when you did look at advertising, as
- 15 you told us, --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- you can't tell us when the Joe Camel
- 18 character was introduced by RJR?
- 19 A. No, I cannot.
- 20 Q. The last decade is the best you can do?
- 21 A. The best I can do.
- 22 Q. But you can see a strong interest by RJR through
- 23 Camel in the youth market?
- 24 A. Yes, I do.
- 25 Q. And that's apparent from these documents?

- 1 A. That is correct.
- 2 Q. And it's apparent from the prior document I
- 3 showed you, the thick one, as well as the three-page
- 4 document?
- 5 A. That is correct.
- 6 (Exhibit 3153 marked for identification.)
- 7 BY MR. MANNING:
- 8 Q. Now you see a letter from Mrs. Jo F. Spach, the
- 9 Manager of Public Information, Public Relations
- 10 Department, to a Ms. Gayle Jorgens, at 4624 Ewing
- 11 Avenue South in Minneapolis, Minnesota?
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. Written on August 25, '89; right?
- 14 A. August 25, 1989, yes.
- 15 Q. Now, you know where Ewing Avenue -- Ewing Avenue
- 16 and 46th is, right?
- 17 A. I do know where 46th and Ewing is, yes.
- 18 Q. This letter starts here by Ms. Jo F. Spach,
- 19 "Thank you for your letter concerning our Camel
- 20 Smooth Character ad campaign. It is helpful to get
- 21 honest reactions from the public in order to better
- 22 evaluate our efforts."
- Now in these prior documents I've shown, these
- 24 prior two, you've seen the Camel Smooth Character ad
- 25 campaign reference; right?

- 1 A. I've seen some references to them, yes. I don't
- 2 know what they were, but I know -- what the campaigns
- 3 were, but I know ad references.
- 4 Q. You've seen them referenced, and the importance
- 5 of those campaigns in RJR's mind, to the young adult
- 6 smoker?
- 7 A. So the documents suggest, yes, sir.
- 8 Q. Right.
- 9 This goes on and says -- this letter by this RJR
- 10 woman, "We were disconcerted by your concerns. Our
- 11 intention with this campaign was one of
- 12 lightheartedness and we never intended to offend
- 13 anyone. We are sorry that our campaign has been
- 14 interpreted otherwise.
- 15 "The Tobacco Industry considers smoking to be a
- 16 custom for those adults who derive pleasure from it.
- 17 We believe that whether to smoke or not is a decision
- 18 that should be freely made by individuals who have
- 19 reached the age of mature judgment."
- 20 Do you take that to be eighteen?
- 21 A. Sorry?
- 22 Q. When she's talking -- who have reached the age
- 23 of mature judgment, do you take that to mean
- 24 eighteen?
- 25 A. I have no idea what they meant by mature

- 1 judgment. Could be eighteen. Could be.
- 2 Q. Okay. "Accordingly, our advertising is directed
- 3 to all adult smokers and not younger people"; do you
- 4 see that?
- 5 A. I do.
- 6 MR. PURVIS: Bill, you inserted the word "all."
- 7 It's not there.
- 8 MR. MANNING: Thank you.
- 9 BY MR. MANNING:
- 10 Q. "Accordingly, our advertising is directed to
- 11 adult smokers and not younger people."
- 12 A. Yes.
- 13 Q. "Also, research shows that among all the factors
- 14 that might influence a young person to start smoking,
- 15 advertising is insignificant"?
- 16 A. That's what it says.
- 17 Q. "We have, of course, reviewed your opinions with
- 18 our advertising executives to make certain that they
- 19 and members of their staff are aware of your
- 20 comments"; do you see that?
- 21 A. Yes, I do.
- 22 Q. Based on the documents you've seen, you would
- 23 disagree, I take it, with this statement that she
- 24 makes, that the advertising is directed to adult
- 25 smokers and not younger people?

- 1 A. I have no idea what advertising is directed
- 2 towards just from the basis of reading a few excerpts
- 3 from documents. And I'm not an advertising expert,
- 4 so sorry. On the basis of the few excerpts I read,
- 5 one would think that getting younger smokers is, of
- 6 course, an objective, yes, sir.
- 7 Q. An objective of the company?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. And one that they attempt to do through
- 10 advertising, as well as other promotional means?
- 11 A. Through whatever means possible, I think. Just
- 12 from the excerpts I've read.
- Now this is obviously not a basic research --
- 14 Q. I understand.
- 15 A. -- endeavor I've undertaken, nor am I qualified
- 16 to talk about advertising, marketing, psychological
- 17 influence on youngsters, things of that nature. As
- 18 long as we understand that.
- 19 Q. Let's go to the next one.
- 20 (Exhibit 3154 marked for identification.)
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. Here's now a letter, second page by David
- 23 Fishel, Senior Vice President, Public Relations,
- 24 R.J. Reynolds. And he is copying this letter to
- 25 Council President Sharon Sayles Belton and others.

- 1 And he sends it to Mayor Don Fraser; right?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. You know Don?
- 4 A. I certainly do.
- 5 Q. You've known him for years?
- 6 A. I've known him for many, many years.
- 7 Q. You have deep respect for him?
- 8 A. Very.
- 9 Q. And can you read the first paragraph of that
- 10 letter?
- 11 A. Surely.
- 12 Q. I'll just -- I want you to read the context of
- 13 the whole thing.
- 14 A. Okay.
- 15 (Reviewing document.)
- 16 Shall I read the whole letter?
- 17 Q. First paragraph. Second paragraph.
- 18 A. Okay.
- 19 (Reviewing document.)
- 20 I've read both paragraphs.
- 21 Q. Now when they make the statement in the second
- 22 sentence, this RJR Public Relation Senior
- 23 Vice President, Dave Fishel, when he writes to
- 24 Mayor Fraser here in 1990 and says in that second
- 25 sentence, "We do not advertise or -- or wish to

- 1 promote our products to anyone under the age of
- 2 eighteen," -- at least as to that second phrase, "or
- 3 wish to promote our products to anyone under the age
- 4 of eighteen, " you have seen sufficient company RJR
- 5 documents in the time frame and the immediate ten
- 6 years prior to 1990, to let you conclude that that
- 7 statement, that they don't wish to promote their
- 8 products to anyone under the age of eighteen, is not
- 9 accurate; correct?
- 10 A. Again, on the basis of the partial documents
- 11 I've seen, without having any expert knowledge of
- 12 advertising, or any of the other disciplines involved
- 13 in marketing, et cetera, et cetera, my answer would
- 14 be yes.
- 15 Q. All right. And it says, "Nor do we have any
- 16 interest or engage in any activity designed to
- 17 encourage nonsmokers, regardless of age, to start
- 18 smoking"; again, that statement, based on the
- 19 documents that you've seen, that I've just shown you
- 20 in the last half hour from RJR, is not true, is it?
- 21 A. Post eighteen-year-old smokers? I have no --
- 22 are you talking about under eighteen-year-old
- 23 smokers?
- 24 Q. Correct.
- 25 A. Under eighteen-year-old smokers? Then, again,

- 1 my answer would be the same as I gave before. With
- 2 the --
- 3 Q. With all the caveats?
- 4 A. With all the caveats, yes.
- 5 Q. With all the caveats, the statement is not true?
- 6 A. With all the caveats, yes.
- 7 Q. That statement that I just read to you in this
- 8 letter, "Nor do we encourage any interest or engage
- 9 in any activity designed to encourage nonsmokers,
- 10 regardless of age, to start smoking," --
- 11 A. I couldn't say regardless of age; in other
- 12 words, I don't know. I haven't got the evidence of
- 13 that. Even from the small -- stipend I was able to
- 14 see from the documents you gave me.
- 15 Post eighteen-year-olds -- I don't know what
- 16 they were -- you were showing me
- 17 pre-eighteen-year-olds and eighteen-year-olds.
- 18 Q. But at least as to pre-eighteen-year-olds, based
- 19 on your review of the documents, with all the
- 20 caveats, clearly they were trying to get
- 21 pre-eighteen-year-olds to start smoking?
- 22 A. Yes, sir.
- 23 Q. So that sentence, as to pre-eighteen-year-olds,
- 24 would not be true?
- 25 A. With all the caveats.

- 1 Q. It would be untrue; correct?
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 I'm not talking as an expert.
- 4 Q. I understand.
- 5 The next sentence there: "Our company's sole
- 6 focus is trying to convince current adult smokers
- 7 that our brands are more desirable than those of our
- 8 competitors."
- 9 Again, based on what you've seen in these
- 10 documents that I've shown you, that statement, "Our
- 11 company's sole focus is to try to convince adult
- 12 smokers to switch from one brand to another, " it's
- 13 just not true, is it?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 15 BY MR. MANNING:
- 16 Q. With all the caveats?
- 17 A. The word that you're focusing upon is sole, is
- 18 that it?
- 19 Q. Correct.
- 20 A. Then, again, with all the caveats, yes.
- 21 Q. Right. This guy who is the head of public
- 22 relations, is Vice President, evidently making a lot
- 23 of money, at least he's got the title of
- 24 vice president, writes to a mayor, who is a former
- 25 United States Congressman, and one of the most

- 1 influential people in the world in foreign relations
- 2 over a period of time, and one of the most brilliant
- 3 men in this country, and while they have inches and
- 4 inches and probably stacks and feet and yards, and
- 5 who knows what else, but at least inches of documents
- 6 that you've seen, this man has the audacity to say to
- 7 Mayor Fraser in print, that their sole focus is to
- 8 get adults to switch from one brand to another;
- 9 correct?
- 10 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 11 THE WITNESS: That's what he says. I can't
- 12 evaluate what he says. But that's what he says.
- 13 BY MR. MANNING:
- 14 Q. Well, you can evaluate what he says in that
- 15 sentence, is in fact, as you've told me, in
- 16 contradiction of what you've seen in the last half
- 17 hour in the documents I've shown you?
- 18 A. With all the caveats previously expressed.
- 19 Q. Right. With all those caveats it's a
- 20 contradiction?
- 21 A. Seeming.
- 22 Q. This sentence, with all these documents --
- 23 seeming --
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Seeming contradiction. Thank you.

- 1 It goes on to say in the third paragraph there,
- 2 second sentence. "If you are an adult who currently
- 3 smokes," --
- 4 A. Sorry. Third paragraph.
- 5 Q. Third paragraph.
- 6 A. Oh yes, I've got it now.
- 7 Q. Keep in mind this man is talking to the mayor of
- 8 a major city, right? "If you are an adult who
- 9 currently smokes, we want your business. If you are
- 10 not, we don't." Meaning if you're a kid, we don't
- 11 want your business. Or if you're an adult who
- 12 doesn't smoke, we don't want your business; that's
- 13 what he's saying, isn't it?
- 14 A. That's what this says, yes.
- 15 Q. And we know, from looking at these documents
- 16 once again, that that sentence, with all the caveats,
- 17 is false; correct?
- 18 A. With all the caveats, and with the possible
- 19 existence of other documents and other evidence, yes.
- 20 Q. Yes, it's false?
- 21 A. Yes, it's false. Or seemingly false.
- 22 Q. I understand.
- But this man goes on to emphasize his point in
- 24 the next sentence -- he doesn't end there. He
- 25 doesn't just say, "If you're an adult who currently

- 1 smokes, we want your business. If you're not, we
- 2 don't." He goes on and says, "It's as simple as
- 3 that. And anyone who accuses us of acting otherwise
- 4 is either misinformed or intentionally
- 5 misrepresenting what we do." See?
- 6 A. That's what he says.
- 7 Q. This man tells the mayor that if the mayor
- 8 himself is making statements like that, that he, as
- 9 the mayor of Minneapolis, is making intentional
- 10 misrepresentations about this great company, RJR;
- 11 right?
- 12 A. You can so interpret it.
- 13 Q. Right.
- 14 And, in fact, what this man is doing, is -- is
- 15 sinister to this mayor, when this man, as a
- 16 representative of RJR, knows full well of the
- 17 existence of these documents and others, that they in
- 18 fact target kids; is that correct?
- 19 MR. PURVIS: Object --
- 20 BY MR. MANNING:
- 21 Q. Correct?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 23 BY MR. MANNING:
- 24 Q. Correct?
- 25 A. I have no way of knowing whether that's correct

- 1 or not. The fact is that there may be other
- 2 extenuating circumstances of which I am not aware.
- 3 The context of the document. Context of a letter.
- 4 Q. Let's go on then, second page of the letter,
- 5 first paragraph.
- 6 A. Second?
- 7 Q. Second page?
- 8 A. Second page. First paragraph.
- 9 Q. Now it just gets a little deeper.
- 10 A. Okay.
- 11 Q. "While many studies have indicated statistical
- 12 correlations between smoking and some diseases,
- 13 statistical associations cannot, by their very
- 14 nature, demonstrate cause and effect relationships";
- 15 do you see that?
- 16 A. I do see that.
- 17 Q. We have seen internal tobacco company documents
- 18 that disagree with that sentence, haven't we? We
- 19 have seen today internal company documents that say
- 20 epidemiological statistical data is conclusive proof
- 21 of cause and effect?
- 22 A. You've shown me such excerpts and such
- 23 documents, that's correct.
- 24 Q. It goes on, "In fact cigarettes have never been
- 25 shown to be the cause of any of the diseases

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 statistically associated with smoking despite three
- 2 decades of intensive scientific research, including
- 3 thousands of laboratory studies that have tried to
- 4 cause these diseases in animals through the
- 5 inhalation of cigarette smoke"; do you see that?
- 6 A. I do.
- 7 Q. And we know that that sentence is a baldfaced
- 8 lie, isn't it?
- 9 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. And you know it?
- 12 A. And I think Mayor Fraser, also.
- 13 Q. Do you think Mayor Fraser knows?
- 14 A. Look, Mayor Fraser read the surgeon general's
- 15 report.
- 16 Q. An so you think a letter by this company that
- 17 attacks the mayor and tells the mayor that he and/or
- 18 others, such as the city council person, Mayor Sharon
- 19 Sayles Belton, or others, you think that he
- 20 immediately, when he reads this letter, concludes I'm
- 21 just -- I just know they're lying. He doesn't even
- 22 have to think about it, is that right?
- 23 A. I would think so.
- 24 Q. That's what you would think?
- 25 A. In other words, credibility is nil, or next to

- 1 nil.
- 2 Q. So here in 1990, when they're making a statement
- 3 like that -- in fact, if Mayor Fraser is supposed to
- 4 immediately conclude that it's a lie, then you would
- 5 agree with me that, in fact, with the credibility
- 6 being next to nil, that this statement, by this man,
- 7 on this company's stationery is, in fact, a baldfaced
- 8 lie?
- 9 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. Correct?
- 12 A. With your interpretation, yes.
- 13 Q. Thank you.
- 14 (Exhibit 3155 marked for identification.)
- 15 BY MR. MANNING:
- 16 Q. Do you consider Mayor Fraser a friend?
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. Someone you have socialized with?
- 19 A. On and off over the years. Not recently,
- 20 though.
- 21 Q. Do you consider Arvonne a friend?
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Do you socialize with her, as well?
- 24 A. Yes. I couldn't socialize with Don, without
- 25 socializing with Arvonne.

- 1 Q. Have you told him you're testifying for the
- 2 tobacco industry?
- 3 A. It never came up.
- 4 Q. You never told him?
- 5 A. I haven't seen them actually in the last year
- 6 and a half, two years, in terms of social
- 7 engagements.
- 8 Q. Do you think you have a responsibility, as a
- 9 friend of his, to talk to your lawyers about the
- 10 protective order and ask them whether or not you can
- 11 call Mayor Fraser to tell him what you've seen?
- 12 A. I would not tell him, obviously. I've signed a
- 13 protective order.
- 14 Q. Do you think, as a matter of principle, and as a
- 15 friend, and as a person of high ethical standards and
- 16 morality, ask to -- your lawyers to talk with us
- 17 about your protective order so that you could at
- 18 least go to Mayor Fraser and tell him about the lies
- 19 that you've witnessed?
- 20 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 21 THE WITNESS: I'm sure that Mayor Fraser is
- 22 fully aware of the letter that he received from this
- 23 PR flack. And I'm sure he took it in the spirit in
- 24 which it was sent. I don't have to tell him about
- 25 that letter.

- 1 BY MR. MANNING:
- 2 Q. Okay. Do you think the -- do you think it's
- 3 acceptable to send letters like that?
- 4 A. I have no idea. I'm not a medical strategist.
- 5 I don't know anything about public relations. I
- 6 don't know what is the morality and ethics of public
- 7 relations and, consequently, I cannot answer that
- 8 question.
- 9 Q. Do you think it is ever, ever acceptable in
- 10 life, at any time?
- 11 A. I'm talking about corporate -- corporate
- 12 activities.
- 13 Q. Listen to me. I want to make sure I understand
- 14 what your view of ethics is, so we understand each
- 15 other from a definitional standpoint.
- Do you think it is ever acceptable, ever in
- 17 life, --
- 18 A. Uh-huh.
- 19 Q. -- because all corporations are made up of
- 20 individuals; right?
- 21 A. Yes, sir.
- 22 Q. There's not a thing such as the corporation,
- 23 other than the people --
- 24 A. Legal -- it's a legal thing.
- 25 Q. Right. Legal entity. But it's made up of

- 1 people?
- 2 A. Uh-huh.
- 3 Q. People in the corporation speak; right?
- 4 A. That's correct.
- 5 Q. The corporation doesn't talk. People talk,
- 6 right?
- 7 A. I assume so.
- 8 Q. Do you think it is ever acceptable in our
- 9 society, for any person, under any conditions, to
- 10 lie?
- 11 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 12 THE WITNESS: I have no idea whether I would
- 13 make such a blanket statement. But I find it
- 14 unacceptable to lie, yes.
- 15 BY MR. MANNING:
- 16 Q. And when you become aware of lying because you
- 17 find it unacceptable, do you, as a professional, feel
- 18 a responsibility to speak against it?
- 19 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- THE WITNESS: As an individual, perhaps, yes.
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. And in this instance, at least, the lying that
- 23 you have just seen and witnessed, and acknowledged
- 24 under oath, you have no intention of speaking out
- 25 about it, do you?
 - STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
 P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 2 THE WITNESS: I have no full knowledge of all of
- 3 this.
- 4 You have asked me a question whether, on the
- 5 basis of the handful of documents, a few handful of
- 6 documents, excerpts of which I've seen, and the basis
- 7 of that letter, whether I thought the contradictions
- 8 in the documents and the letter were a lie. I said
- 9 they were seemingly that. All right?
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. All right.
- 12 A. I have to have more than that to get up on -- on
- 13 the podium and condemn an individual, an institution,
- 14 or a corporation.
- 15 Q. And at least you would agree with me, and I'm
- 16 going to show you a few more documents, and at the
- 17 end of showing you those documents I'm going to have
- 18 shown you forty-four documents, I'll represent to
- 19 you, --
- 20 A. Okay.
- 21 Q. -- that were on the list that I provided to your
- 22 lawyers.
- 23 A. Excerpts.
- 24 Q. That's right.
- 25 Forty-four documents.

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 Q. They showed you this list.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. You didn't look at any documents last night?
- 5 A. Absolutely not. I had no knowledge what those
- 6 numbers meant.
- 7 Q. The first documents you saw were the ones I've
- 8 shown you?
- 9 A. That is correct.
- 10 Q. And at least you have clearly said that based on
- 11 the documents that I've shown you, in more than one
- 12 instance, there is a seeming -- at least seeming lie
- 13 occurring --
- 14 A. Let's call it contradiction.
- 15 Q. Okay. We can call it that.
- 16 A. Call it contradiction. A lie is a very strong
- 17 word.
- 18 Q. Yeah.
- 19 A. And I'm not sure I would go that far.
- 20 In fact, in my previous answers to you, may I
- 21 amend those to say contradictions?
- 22 Q. Let me just say this, sir.
- 23 A. Yes.
- ${\tt 24}~{\tt Q.}~{\tt That~your~previous~answers~stand.}~{\tt And~you~can}$
- 25 say anything you want now, to --

- 1 A. Okay. At this point I would amend my previous
- 2 answers.
- 3 Q. I just want to tell you something.
- 4 A. Let them stand. But let the record also show
- 5 that in thinking over this question, and in thinking
- 6 over the line of questioning, I now want to amend
- 7 that, saying contradiction.
- 8 Thank you.
- 9 Q. But, in fact, sir, I've spoken to you over a
- 10 period of almost twelve hours for two days, --
- 11 A. Yes, sir.
- 12 Q. -- so there have been many times that I've asked
- 13 you about seeming lies and contradictions.
- 14 A. Always in a hypothetical or in a very general
- 15 kind of sense, with only limited evidence.
- 16 Q. And what I'm now asking you is a different
- 17 matter. Whether you characterize it now, here, as we
- 18 close, as a contradiction, however you want to
- 19 characterize it; okay?
- 20 A. Uh-huh.
- 21 Q. Let it -- I want to be clear. When you leave
- 22 here, based on the forty-four documents that you will
- 23 see, --
- 24 A. Sure.
- 25 Q. -- you have no intention of asking to see more

- 1 documents to see for yourself whether or not the
- 2 seeming lie, the lie, the contradiction, however you
- 3 want to characterize it, at this time, you have no
- 4 intention of exploring further the depth or gravity
- 5 of that?
- 6 A. I have no intention of so doing. Yes, sir.
- 7 Q. Thank you.
- 8 And you feel that you ethically, as a professor
- 9 at the University of Minnesota, have absolutely no
- 10 duty or responsibility to do so?
- 11 A. Not in this particular instance, no, sir.
- 12 Q. You've got that document?
- 13 A. Yeah, I have this.
- 14 Q. Marked as what?
- 15 A. 3155.
- 16 Q. Now, looking at it, sir, this is a Brown and
- 17 Williamson document; right?
- 18 A. Yes. B&W.
- 19 Q. Yeah. From a Forsythe to a Sharp, right?
- 20 A. From A.G. Forsythe to R.D. Sharp, yes, sir.
- 21 Q. In '85, right?
- 22 A. In -- yes.
- 23 Q. Just please read the first page of the document,
- 24 if you will.
- 25 A. The entire document?

- 1 Q. First page.
- 2 A. First page?
- 3 Q. The purpose and key issues.
- 4 A. All right. Purpose.
- 5 (Reviewing document.)
- 6 I have read the first page.
- 7 Q. Second page, please?
- 8 A. Second page?
- 9 Q. Please.
- 10 A. (Reviewing document.)
- 11 Q. Have you read halfway down, sir?
- 12 A. I've read most. One last line.
- 13 Q. Once again --
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. -- at least here we see another brand that is
- 16 interested in the young adult smoker; correct?
- 17 A. That's correct.
- 18 Q. Kool?
- 19 A. That's correct.
- 20 (Exhibit 3156 marked for identification.)
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. Now, sir, showing you what's been marked as
- 23 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 3156, this is from a Dana
- 24 Blackmar to Rick McReynolds; right?
- 25 A. That is correct.

- 1 Q. The date is 2/7/74?
- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. And it says in the first paragraph, "I think the
- 4 French advertisement for Camel filters is a smash.
- 5 It would work equally well, if not better, for Camel
- 6 Regular. It's about as young as you can get and aims
- 7 right at the young adult smoker Camel needs to
- 8 attract"; do you see that?
- 9 A. I see that. Yes, sir.
- 10 Q. I can't tell what that author meant precisely by
- 11 "...as young as you can get"; does it --
- 12 A. I can't read his mind. No, sir.
- 13 Q. No. We just know we've seen other RJR documents
- 14 that go as low as twelve-years-old; right?
- 15 A. I've seen such documents. Yes, sir.
- 16 (Exhibit 3157 marked for identification.)
- 17 BY MR. MANNING:
- 18 Q. Showing you, sir, what's marked as 3157, this is
- 19 from an L.A. Pizer to R.A. Pittman, right?
- 20 A. From L.A. Pizer to R.A. Pittman, yes.
- 21 Q. It's a B&W document?
- 22 A. It is a B&W document, yes, sir.
- 23 Q. Titled, "Advertising History"; right?
- 24 A. That is correct.
- 25 Q. Then, sir, if you can just turn to page five of

- 1 the document, if you will.
- 2 A. Page five. Yes, sir. I'm on page five.
- 3 Q. First paragraph of the summary it says, "In
- 4 summary, I feel that the history of the three brands
- 5 reviewed clearly shows that advertising has an
- 6 important role in the success or failure of a
- 7 cigarette brand. The ability to find and maintain a
- 8 strong advertising theme was clearly shown by
- 9 Marlboro and Winston. On the other hand, Viceroy has
- 10 shown to be unable to commit to one ongoing copy
- 11 platform"; do you see that?
- 12 A. Yes, I do.
- 13 Q. And we haven't read the whole document
- 14 together. It was titled an "Advertising History,"
- 15 but at least from that summary we can conclude that
- 16 this author in 1974 felt that advertising was
- 17 important in the success of cigarette brand?
- 18 A. That's what the paragraph that you read to me
- 19 indicates, yes, sir.
- 20 (Exhibit 3158 marked for identification.)
- 21 BY MR. MANNING:
- 22 Q. Here we now have a document that's April of '81,
- 23 right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. B&W from Stebbins to Veatch?

- 1 A. From Stebbins to Veatch, yes, sir.
- 2 Q. Now, here she says -- or whoever says, P.W.
- 3 Stebbins, "Dick, I just received a call from a Betty
- 4 Carr of the Tobacco Road retail store in Houston,
- 5 Texas. Ms. Carr was complaining about the sampling
- 6 techniques Donley is using with BARCLAY"; do you see
- 7 that?
- 8 A. I do.
- 9 Q. "She indicates that for at least a week, people,
- 10 mainly teenagers, have been coming in to her and
- 11 other retail outlets in the downtown Houston area
- 12 with literally shopping bags full of BARCLAY. They
- 13 either want to sell the cigarettes to her or exchange
- 14 them for brands they smoke"; do you see that?
- 15 A. I do.
- 16 Q. "Ms. Carr feels this is detrimental to the
- 17 tobacco retailers in the area."
- 18 Let's just skip down to the last paragraph. She
- 19 says -- or the author says -- "Aren't the samplers
- 20 supposed to change locations?--i.e., from the
- 21 inner-city, to suburban shopping centers, et cetera?
- 22 One of Ms. Carr's biggest complaints is that
- 23 teenagers have been invading her store for a week or
- 24 more. Had it been for a day or so, we probably
- 25 wouldn't have heard from her."

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Do you see that?
- 2 A. I do.
- 3 Q. So it would appear at least from this memo so
- 4 far, that somebody is down in Houston handing out a
- 5 whole lot of samples?
- 6 A. That's what it appears to be, yes, sir.
- 7 Q. Handing them out free, right?
- 8 A. That's what it appears to be.
- 9 Q. An kids, teenagers, are coming in with shopping
- 10 bags full of these products?
- 11 A. That's what it states here, yes.
- 12 Q. And then, there's an interesting little PS on
- 13 the memo. "In June of '79, Stebbins says, just
- 14 confirming to Veatch what was occurring in Houston, I
- 15 personally walked four blocks in Dallas with a
- 16 business associate to change some airline
- 17 reservations. Our round trip from the hotel to
- 18 ticket office netted four cartons of ARCTIC LIGHTS
- 19 each. Not bad for a nonsmoker."
- 20 Again, Stebbins is acknowledging that he
- 21 personally, in walking four blocks in the Dallas
- 22 area, received quite a few samples free?
- 23 A. That's what he says, yes.
- 24 Q. That's a technique, as far as you know, of
- 25 distributing cigarettes to young people, to get them

- 1 to start smoking?
- 2 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 3 THE WITNESS: I have no idea how widespread that
- 4 was, or is, or when it began, or anything like that,
- 5 no, sir, I do not. I knew that it existed.
- 6 BY MR. MANNING:
- 7 Q. You knew it existed?
- 8 A. Yes, sir.
- 9 Q. You knew it from your historical analysis?
- 10 A. I knew it from reading. In one source or
- 11 another I've come across it, yes, sir.
- 12 Q. You have seen it?
- 13 A. Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. Did you see it in your historical analysis?
- 15 A. I assume so.
- 16 Q. And you have no idea how widespread it is?
- 17 A. I have no idea.
- 18 Q. You didn't ask about it?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. You don't know if it varies from one state to
- 21 another?
- MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- THE WITNESS: No.
- 24 BY MR. MANNING:
- 25 Q. You don't know how much money each tobacco

- 1 company spends on samples and free cigarettes in an
- 2 attempt to get kids hooked?
- 3 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.
- 4 THE WITNESS: No.
- 5 BY MR. MANNING:
- 6 Q. You don't know if it's primarily directed at
- 7 kids, or adults, or both, do you?
- 8 A. I have no idea.
- 9 (Exhibit 3159 marked for identification.)
- 10 BY MR. MANNING:
- 11 Q. This again is a B&W document, right?
- 12 A. On the top of it it says so, yes.
- 13 Q. Titled, "Product Movie Placement," right?
- 14 A. Yes, sir.
- 15 Q. The purpose is to review the corporate policy
- 16 involving movie placements?
- 17 A. Yes, sir.
- 18 Q. The purpose here is to review the corporate
- 19 policy regarding movie placements; right?
- 20 A. That's what it says in A, yes.
- 21 Q. Turn to page two, please.
- 22 A. Three?
- 23 Q. Two.
- 24 A. Yes, sir.
- 25 Q. Down in the last paragraph.

- 1 A. Yes, sir.
- 2 Q. It says, "Product usage/association with a
- 3 specific star provides exposure and linkage with a
- 4 star's personality/character. Stars tend to set
- 5 trends; example, Disco Dancing with Saturday Night
- 6 Live"; right?
- 7 A. Saturday Night Fever.
- 8 Q. Saturday Night Fever, right?
- 9 A. Yes. I see that.
- 10 Q. Do you know who the star was in Saturday Night
- 11 Fever?
- 12 A. I have no idea.
- 13 Q. Turn to the next page, please.
- 14 A. (Complying.)
- 15 Q. Four bullet points down, under "Key Issues" it
- 16 says: "Association with a specific star's image can
- 17 enhance and build a brand's" --
- 18 A. I'm sorry, I can't --
- 19 Q. Four --
- 20 A. Oh, I'm sorry. I see it.
- 21 Okay.
- 22 Q. "Association with a specific star's image can
- 23 enhance/build a brand's personality, more so than
- 24 traditional media"; right?
- 25 A. That's what it says, right.

- 1 Q. So it would appear that Brown and Williamson is
- 2 analyzing its product movie placement techniques in
- 3 this document; correct?
- 4 A. So it seems, yes, sir.
- 5 (Exhibit 3160 marked for identification.)
- 6 BY MR. MANNING:
- 7 Q. Here we have a document written by James F.
- 8 Ripslinger, Senior Vice President of Associated Film
- 9 Promotions. CC's James Coleman at Brown and
- 10 Williamson; right?
- 11 A. CC, yes.
- 12 Q. It says, "Dear Mr. Stallone" -- it's written to
- 13 Sylvester Stallone, right?
- 14 A. That is correct.
- 15 Q. Could you just read that letter, please?
- 16 A. Read it?
- 17 Q. Please.
- 18 A. Yes, sir.
- 19 (Reviewing document.)
- I have completed reading this document.
- 21 Q. It would appear that Brown and Williamson is
- 22 going to pay Sylvester Stallone a sizeable amount of
- 23 money in order for him to smoke their cigarettes in
- 24 films that he's in; is that correct?
- 25 MR. PURVIS: Object to the form.

- 1 THE WITNESS: The letter indicates that.
- 2 BY MR. MANNING:
- 3 Q. And you don't have any idea of these five films
- 4 that are mentioned, what the age targeted audience is
- 5 of the films, do you?
- 6 A. I have no way of knowing that.
- 7 Q. You don't know how many kids under eighteen come
- 8 to these films?
- 9 A. No, I have no way of knowing that, sir.
- 10 Q. You have no idea, for example, how many kids
- 11 will see -- have seen Rocky IV?
- 12 A. No knowledge about that.
- 13 Q. You have no idea whether this violates the
- 14 tobacco advertising code that --
- 15 A. I have no way of knowing that.
- 16 Q. -- the companies -- that Brown and Williamson
- 17 entered into specifically?
- 18 A. I have no way of knowing that, sir.
- 19 Q. Were you aware that they did this kind of thing
- 20 before today?
- 21 A. I think I had seen references to that one way or
- 22 another recently in the press.
- 23 Q. Recently in the press?
- 24 A. Recently, yes.
- In fact, I think I've seen references to

- 1 Mr. Stallone in the press on this particular issue.
- 2 Q. And do you think that's an ethical thing to do,
- 3 for the tobacco companies to do, to pay this kind of
- 4 money to movie stars?
- 5 A. I have no view of that, sir. I'm not familiar
- 6 with what the procedures are, what the methods are,
- 7 and what the ethics are in these kinds of things,
- 8 sir.
- 9 Q. No view of that at all?
- 10 A. No view of that, sir.
- 11 Q. Prior to this historical analysis, sir, you
- 12 never did any work whatsoever with respect to the
- 13 subject of tobacco; correct?
- 14 A. By work do you mean research?
- 15 Q. Any work at all.
- 16 A. Oh yes. I included tobacco and tobacco-related
- 17 issues in some of the courses I teach, particularly
- 18 Early American courses. The first part of the survey
- 19 deals extensively with tobacco as a crop, as a kind
- 20 of development tool for Colonial America, stuff like
- 21 that.
- 22 I dealt -- deal with tobacco and tobacco
- 23 questions in terms of -- of the development of
- 24 cigarette control in the Industrial Revolution and
- 25 its popularity as a -- as a consumer item in my 20th

- 1 Century U.S. History class. In that sense I've
- 2 worked on the issue of tobacco in my classes. But in
- 3 terms of having done any research, the answer is no.
- 4 Q. So the only work that you've done that's been
- 5 tobacco-related is the teaching in the various
- 6 courses that you've generally just summarized?
- 7 A. That is correct.
- 8 Q. Do you have your report handy?
- 9 A. Pardon me?
- 10 Q. Do you have your report?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. For example, on page three of your report --
- 13 A. Page three? Yes, sir.
- 14 Q. -- you say that you intend to testify regarding
- 15 the longstanding and widespread awareness of the
- 16 American public, including the awareness of the
- 17 citizens of Minnesota, on and on; who you're talking
- 18 about there are individual Minnesota citizens?
- 19 A. I'm talking about generic Minnesota citizens.
- 20 Q. Made up of individuals? You're not talking
- 21 about the Governor?
- 22 A. Oh no, no, no. I'm talking about the whole
- 23 climate of opinion within the context of the
- 24 Minnesota citizen, yes.
- 25 Q. Uh-huh.

- 1 A. In terms of individuals, no.
- 2 Q. You're not talking about individuals?
- 3 A. No, sir.
- 4 Q. You're talking about --
- 5 A. Except when we deal with individuals who are
- 6 activists, one way or another, on this particular
- 7 issue and play a significant role in either raising
- 8 awareness or not raising awareness.
- 9 Q. So what you're talking about is the climate?
- 10 A. And awareness, yes, sir.
- 11 Q. Climate and awareness of the citizens of
- 12 Minnesota?
- 13 A. Exactly.
- 14 Q. But not individuals?
- 15 A. Exactly. Exactly.
- 16 Q. So how do you talk about the citizens of
- 17 Minnesota, if you're not talking about individual
- 18 Minnesotans?
- 19 A. Well, historians do that all the time, sir.
- 20 Q. That's what I want to understand.
- 21 A. Historians do that all the time. We have to
- 22 make generalizations based on preponderance of
- 23 evidence dealing with a people and a society.
- 24 Q. Uh-huh.
- You go on, on page four of your report, and you

- 1 say, I -- end of that first paragraph, "I will
- 2 specifically discuss the State of Minnesota's
- 3 longstanding awareness..."
- 4 A. Yes.
- 5 Q. Who is the State of Minnesota?
- 6 A. State of Minnesota -- what I'm referring to, are
- 7 the state institutions, governmental bodies, agencies
- 8 within the state.
- 9 Q. So there you are not referring to Minnesota
- 10 citizens?
- 11 A. No, sir.
- 12 Q. So when you refer to the state of Minnesota's
- 13 longstanding awareness, you are referring there to
- 14 government?
- 15 A. Governmental agencies of various kinds. Yes,
- 16 sir.
- 17 Q. Are there specific ones you're referring to?
- 18 A. Yes. The legislative branch.
- 19 Q. Okay.
- 20 A. The executive branch. And the executive branch
- 21 would be, of course, the various state agencies that
- 22 played a significant role in tobacco health-related
- 23 issues, such as the Minnesota State Department of
- 24 Health, the Minnesota Department of Education, and
- 25 similar such institutions.

- 1 Q. Going on in the next paragraph, when you speak
- 2 there about the State of Minnesota. You testify
- 3 about the State of Minnesota action and inaction,
- 4 particularly while the state was aware of the health
- 5 risks. What do you mean there when you're talking
- 6 about the State?
- 7 A. I'm sorry?
- 8 Q. What do you mean there when you're talking about
- 9 the State?
- 10 A. I'm talking about the State's public policy
- 11 actions.
- 12 Q. So there you're not talking about one, per se,
- 13 portion of government. They're you're talking about
- 14 the state's public policy actions?
- 15 A. Which includes legislative enactments signed
- 16 into law by the Governor; therefore, it's involvement
- 17 of the two different branches of government and
- 18 possibly even the judiciary, if it's challenged. I
- 19 don't know of anything that was challenged
- 20 specifically, but it could be.
- 21 Q. So at least in the first few questions here,
- 22 where we've talked about the State, on page three
- 23 you've told me that the State is the citizens of
- 24 Minnesota?
- 25 A. No, I didn't say that. I said -- we talked

- 1 about the citizens of Minnesota in one category and
- 2 the state in another category.
- 3 Q. Fine. At least here --
- 4 A. They are interrelated, certainly. I mean
- 5 obviously.
- 6 Q. On pages three and four, though, when you were
- 7 speaking about the citizens of the State, --
- 8 A. Yes.
- 9 Q. -- you're talking about the general citizens,
- 10 not individuals, per se?
- 11 A. Exactly.
- 12 Q. Then, when we go to page four, there are times
- 13 when you're talking about -- when you use the State
- 14 of Minnesota, you're talking about the legislative
- 15 branch and the executive branch and its departments?
- 16 A. Right.
- 17 Q. There are other times when you're talking about
- 18 the state of Minnesota, you're talking about the
- 19 State's public policy?
- 20 A. Which includes actions of the legislative branch
- 21 and executive branch, obviously. They're not
- 22 unrelated.
- 23 Q. I understand.
- 24 A. Okay.
- 25 Q. For me to understand exactly what you're

- 1 referring to in your report, when you refer to the
- 2 state, the state of Minnesota, the citizens of
- 3 Minnesota, various things that you use to
- 4 describe, -- we would need to go through, when you
- 5 talk about Minnesotans' knowledge, we need to go
- 6 through and define that each time to understand this
- 7 report, don't we?
- 8 A. Not necessarily. I think it's -- any historian
- 9 or knowledgeable person would know exactly what I'm
- 10 talking about in reading that report.
- 11 Q. You don't define those terms anywhere in this
- 12 report?
- 13 A. Not in this report, no, sir.
- 14 Q. In the forty-seven pages those terms are not
- 15 defined anywhere?
- 16 A. I think anyone with a decent education and
- 17 knowledge would know what I'm talking about when I'm
- 18 talking about Minnesotans in the state of Minnesota.
- 19 Q. Are there any other typos other than the one
- 20 we've found on page four?
- 21 A. I haven't found any other, but I haven't
- 22 looked.
- Oh yes, I think I saw Phyllis Kahn's name was
- 24 spelled with one L instead of two. And I --
- 25 unforgivable.

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

- 1 Q. Now your lawyer brought some published articles
- 2 that you did. Did you see these, that they brought
- 3 and gave to me?
- 4 A. I haven't seen what they've found. But I'm
- 5 familiar with the articles, of course.
- 6 Q. One of them is "Defeat of Unions Accompanied
- 7 Economic Decline For Most"?
- 8 A. That's part of the series I did for St. Paul
- 9 Pioneer Press, if I am not mistaken.
- 10 Q. This?
- 11 A. Yes.
- 12 Q. One title. Another title, "Political
- 13 Anti-Semitism in Minnesota During the Great
- 14 Depression"?
- 15 A. Yes, "Journal of Jewish Social Studies," yes,
- 16 sir.
- 17 Q. Another is "Essays on Jewish Lives and Thought"?
- 18 A. No. That is a chapter in that book.
- 19 If you'll turn the page.
- 20 Q. Did you write that?
- 21 A. Yes. That -- this "Cloakmakers Strike of 1910."
- 22 Q. That was written in 1959?
- 23 A. That's correct.
- 24 Q. This one, "Political Anti-Semitism in
- 25 Minnesota"?

- 1 A. '76.
- 2 Q. When?
- 3 A. '76.
- 4 Q. This?
- 5 A. '90s. '93.
- 6 Q. '92?
- 7 A. '92.
- 8 Q. When's the last time you were published?
- 9 A. Just last March.
- 10 Q. On what?
- 11 A. It was a book review with the Journal of
- 12 American History.
- 13 Q. What was that on?
- 14 A. It was on a book written by Eva Morawska on a
- 15 small -- Johnstown, Pennsylvania, and some ethnic
- 16 community there.
- 17 Q. And there's something you wrote called
- 18 "They Chose Minnesota"?
- 19 A. No. It's a chapter in that ethic collection of
- 20 Minnesota Historical Society. Which -- "Jews in
- 21 Minnesota."
- 22 Q. Written when?
- 23 A. That was in '82 or '83. Somewhere in that...
- 24 Q. Then there's one book titled "Education for Work
- 25 and Labor Solidarity: Immigrant Miners and

590

1	Radicalism	on	+ha	Magahi	Pange"	2
1	Radicalism	OH	LHE	Mesabi	Range"	•

- 2 A. That's correct.
- 3 Q. What's the year of that publication?
- 4 A. That was done as part of a Ford Foundation
- 5 project in the late '60s.
- 6 There will be another article coming out at the
- 7 end of this month, or next month, on a short history
- 8 of business in Minnesota, in the Minnesota Business
- 9 Catalog.
- 10 Q. What's that about?
- 11 A. If you wish a copy of that, I'd be happy to send
- 12 you one.
- 13 Q. What's it about?
- 14 A. Survey of the development of business enterprise
- 15 in Minnesota from fur trade to the present. It's
- 16 really a very general survey. Done as an
- 17 introduction to the business catalog.
- 18 MR. MANNING: Okay. Thank you very much, sir.
- 19 MR. PURVIS: Thank you.
- 20 THE WITNESS: Thank you.
- 21 (Concluded at 3:56 p.m.)
- 22 ***

23

24

25

STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
P.O. BOX 18188, MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418 1-800-553-1953

591

```
1
                       CERTIFICATE
 3
    STATE OF MINNESOTA
 5
    COUNTY OF GOODHUE
 6
              I hereby certify that I reported the
 7 deposition of DR. HYMAN BERMAN, on the 16th day of
    September, 1997, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and that
 8 the witness was, by me, first duly sworn to tell the
    truth;
 9
              That the testimony was transcribed by me
10 and is a true record of the testimony of the witness;
             That I am not a relative, or employee, or
    attorney, or counsel, of any of the parties; or a
12 relative or employee of such attorney or counsel;
13
             That I am not financially interested in the
    action and have no contract with the parties,
14 attorneys, or persons with an interest in the action
    that affects or has a substantial tendency to affect
15 my impartiality;
              That the right to read and sign the
    deposition by the witness was reserved.
17
              WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL this 22nd day of
18 September, 1997.
19
20
                        Janet D. Winberg, RPR
2.1
                       Notary Public, Goodhue County, MN
                       My Commission expires 1/31/2000.
22
    {Seal}
23
24
25
                   STIREWALT & ASSOCIATES
```